



**This electronic thesis or dissertation has been
downloaded from Explore Bristol Research,
<http://research-information.bristol.ac.uk>**

Author:

Ellis, Norman John

Title:

Vasiliy Grossman : the genesis and evolution of heresy.

General rights

Access to the thesis is subject to the Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International Public License. A copy of this may be found at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>. This license sets out your rights and the restrictions that apply to your access to the thesis so it is important you read this before proceeding.

Take down policy

Some pages of this thesis may have been removed for copyright restrictions prior to having it been deposited in Explore Bristol Research. However, if you have discovered material within the thesis that you consider to be unlawful e.g. breaches of copyright (either yours or that of a third party) or any other law, including but not limited to those relating to patent, trademark, confidentiality, data protection, obscenity, defamation, libel, then please contact collections-metadata@bristol.ac.uk and include the following information in your message:

- Your contact details
- Bibliographic details for the item, including a URL
- An outline nature of the complaint

Your claim will be investigated and, where appropriate, the item in question will be removed from public view as soon as possible.

VASILIIY GROSSMAN: THE GENESIS AND EVOLUTION OF HERESY

NORMAN JOHN ELLIS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL IN
ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE FACULTY OF ARTS.

DEPARTMENT OF RUSSIAN STUDIES

MARCH 1990

Abstract

Prevailing wisdom avers that the Great Fatherland War is the crucial event in Vasilii Grossman's disaffection from Soviet power. The importance of the war cannot be denied. Yet this thesis seeks to show that the origins of Grossman's heresy are to be found in the thirties. It will be argued that collectivisation, industrialisation and above all the Terror are the catalysts leading to Grossman's wholesale renunciation of Marxism-Leninism and his search for a coherent and humane alternative. To this end the evolution of certain themes will be examined from before the war to their maturation in Zhizn' i sud'ba and Vse techet.

Chapter I brings together many recently published sources of biographical information. Additionally it states the nature of the problem to be solved. Given the significance of the war for Grossman's writing, chapter II examines the major trends in Soviet war literature from 1941 up to and including the accession of Gorbachev. Particular attention is paid to the problem of Remarquism. Chapter III examines the key works written by Grossman during the war years. Their importance for the post-war period is apparent in chapter IV. Grossman's ocherki and povesti are the basis for many of his finest portraits of Soviet soldiers. Chapter V analyses the peculiarly Soviet phenomenon of the commissar and his interaction with the officer and the rank and file.

Concepts of war and progress are the subject of chapter VI. A detailed analysis of Grossman's sole play, "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam", in many respects a seminal work, argues that its central theme is fundamentally inimical to Marxist-Leninist teleology. Subsequent sections examine the role of the scientist in Grossman's work, the view that scientific research and political heresy are inextricably linked. Attention is also focused on the interrelationship of war and historical change. Throughout Za pravoe delo and Zhizn' i sud'ba we are conscious of an affinity with Tolstoy. A final section considers the extent to which Grossman's concepts of war differ from, or compare with, those of Tolstoy.

The final chapter considers the nature of the totalitarian state as recorded in Grossman's writing. Special attention has been given to a number of Grossman's neglected pre-war rasskazy. Not published until the sixties, they are harrowing accounts of upheaval and the effects of social engineering. All three of Grossman's major novels concern themselves with the nature of the tyrant. Classical, medieval and Tsarist antecedents allude to Stalin in Stepan Kol'chugin. In Za pravoe delo Grossman explores certain aspects of Stalinism through the medium of Hitler's Germany. Both Nazi and Soviet systems are explicitly identified as coessential in Zhizn' i sud'ba. This chapter concludes with an analysis of Grossman's most damning thesis, expounded in Vse techet, that Lenin, not Stalin was the architect of Soviet slavery.

Dedication and Acknowledgements

Research for a doctoral thesis relies heavily upon the services of a good library and efficient librarians. Bristol University is endowed with both. I would particularly like to thank the staff of the Inter-Library Loan Service. Their knowledge, experience and patience were of immense value. I am in no doubt that without such an excellent service this thesis would have suffered greatly. Likewise I am obliged to thank the staff of the British Library, both in Great Russell Street and at the Newspaper Library at Colindale. The Newspaper Library is a superb resource for the researcher in Soviet studies. I regret that I was unable to spend more time perusing its papers and microfilm. Thanks are also due to Mr C. N. Donnelly at the Soviet Studies Research Centre Sandhurst for the kind offer to avail myself of the library.

Writing this thesis, I had occasion to consult Slavists as well as scholars in other disciplines. I would like to thank the following: Mr Thomas Wiedemann, The Department of Classics and Archaeology, University of Bristol; Dr Anthony Grenville, Department of German, University of Bristol; Professor Efim Etkind; Professor Shimon Markish, University of Geneva; Professor. Dr. Wolfgang Kasack, University of Cologne; Professor. Dr. E. Reißner, Institut für Slavistik der Johannes Gutenberg - Universität Mainz; the late Viktor Nekrasov for his comments on Remarquism; and those who make the BUAS 20th Century Study Conferences such valuable events.

Finally, I must thank the staff in the Department of Russian Studies, University of Bristol. Their moral support has been unstinting; their intellectual vigour and enthusiasm stimulating. Above all I must acknowledge the role of my academic supervisor, Mr Robert Porter, Senior Lecturer in Russian. His erudition, experience, sense of proportion and incisive reasoning, not to mention his generous hospitality, have been a source of great comfort in some of the lonelier moments. I am deeply indebted.

I dedicate this thesis unreservedly to those who after decades of tyranny are beginning to free themselves. Fraught with uncertainties, their road is long and dangerous. Let it please God that they succeed in their quest.

Author's Declaration

I declare that the research and writing undertaken for this thesis reflect my own individual efforts and were not conducted in collaboration - my acknowledgements notwithstanding - with any other scholar. Needless to say, so are the historical errors, solecisms in logic and the interpretation of Grossman's life and fate for which I, and I alone, take full responsibility.

Signed... N. Klyb 28.03.1990.

Transliteration

Transliteration in this thesis conforms to the system of B.S. (Modified).

Dating Convention.

Unless otherwise stated dates of works refer to the dates of publication.

Quotations in Russian.

Throughout this thesis quotations are given in the original Russian. Where a Russian quotation can be incorporated into an English sentence in such a way as to be consistent with the English grammar (for example the English 'of' followed by the genitive case in Russian), then the oblique case has been retained. Where this is not possible the Russian quotation is given in the Russian nominative. The oblique case is indicated in the source notes.

Table of Contents

	Pages.
1. The Life and Fate of Vasilii Grossman.....	1-25.
2. The Changing Ethos of Soviet War Literature.....	26-58.
3. The War Years.....	59-93.
4. Post-War Images of the Soviet Soldier.....	94-119.
5. Soldiers and Commissars: Army and Party in Conflict.....	120-166.
6. Concepts of War and Progress.....	167-227.
7. Inside the Totalitarian State.....	228-309.
8. Concluding Remarks.....	310-313.
9. Endnotes.....	314-357.
10. Bibliography, Part I: Vasilii Grossman: Primary Sources.	358-360.
Part II: Vasilii Grossman: Secondary Literature.....	361-365.
Part III: Secondary Reading and Texts.....	366-377.

The public evil enters the house of each man,
the gates of his courtyard cannot keep it
out, it leaps over the high wall; let him
flee to a corner of his bedchamber, it will
certainly find him out.

Solon of Athens.

It is law also to obey the counsel of one.

Heraclitus of Ephesus.

The Life and Fate of Vasilii Grossman

Chapter I

I

During his lifetime Vasilii Semenovich Grossman experienced the crushing persecution and isolation which were the inevitable consequences for those Soviet writers bold enough to ignore the dictates of ideology and set upon following those of truth and conscience instead. Until recently the author and his work have been largely overshadowed by the more famous names of Soviet literature, such as Anna Akhmatova, Boris Pasternak and Alexander Solzhenitsyn.¹ Yet in Grossman's two major works, Life and Fate (Zhizn' i sud'ba; 1980) and Everything Flows (Vse techet; 1970), we find one of the most damning indictments of Stalinism ever likely to appear, and in the case of Vse techet the systematic annihilation of the Lenin cult. For this reason alone Vse techet is arguably the most subversive piece of literature ever to have been penned by a Soviet writer. The Soviet publication of Zhizn' i sud'ba and Vse techet are, therefore, major literary events, representing an unprecedented volte-face even by the standards of glasnost, and one which raises questions of general importance for Soviet literature. What now is the status of socialist realism? Is it possible to define boundaries between orthodoxy and heresy? Do the concepts of orthodoxy and heresy still have any relevance in the arts? Are they now only of interest to the literary historian? Most important of all: what is the nature of the process in which Grossman was transformed from someone, who by all accounts supported the regime, to an 'apostle of freedom'? ²

Vasilii Semenovich Grossman was born on 12th December 1905 in the town of Berdichev, a town well known for its thriving Jewish community and the excellence of its craftsmen. Grossman's father, Semen Osipovich, was a chemical engineer and his mother, Ekaterina Savel'evna taught French. In 1914 Grossman entered Kiev's secondary school, remaining there until 1919, whereupon, as a result of the Civil War, he returned to Berdichev. In 1921 he entered Kiev's Institute of Higher Education and two years later was accepted into the Department of Chemistry of the Physics and Maths Faculty of Moscow University. In 1929, a key year in Soviet history, Grossman completed

his formal studies.

The lack of money was a constant problem and throughout this period, in the time-honoured tradition of impecunious Russian students, Grossman gave lessons. In addition he worked as a supervisor in a labour commune for homeless children, many of whom were orphaned by the Revolution and the ravages of the Civil War. This phase of his life seems to have brought home to him the social consequences of war. Orphans are commonly found in his work, and it is not inconceivable that this awareness of their plight owes its inception to the time spent with these children while a student.

Despite social obligations and the demands of study, Grossman took part in an expedition to Central Asia. We find a similar event incorporated in the biography of the doctor, Sofya Levinton, who appears in Zhizn' i sud'ba. What the aim of this expedition was, and what Grossman's precise role was, we do not know.

To this period belong Grossman's first literary efforts; two short articles, one published in Nasha gazeta (07.07.1928), and the other in Pravda (13.07.1928). In the same year Grossman's sketch, "Berdichev in all Seriousness" ("Berdichev ne v shutku, a vser'ez") was published in Ogonyok.³ After graduation Grossman worked as a chemical analyst in the Donbass mines. He held other posts, being employed alternatively in the Donbass Institute of Pathology and Hygiene as a senior research assistant, and as an assistant in the department of inorganic chemistry of the Stalino Medical Institute. The title of one his research papers indicates the importance of his work for the miners' safety: "Concerning the Presence and Origins of Carbon Monoxide in the Coal Bearing Strata of the Donbass".⁴ Few writers were better prepared scientifically to undertake the grim task that was to come of understanding and describing Hitler's death camps.

Grossman's recollections for this period reflect a noticeable ambivalence. He is excited by the challenge of working in the Smolyanka II mine; the deepest, biggest, and need one say, the most dangerous of the Soviet mines. But there are material difficulties, loneliness and isolation :

Я очень тосковал по вечерам. За долгие месяцы
никто не пришел ко мне в гости. Я был застенчив,
знакомства с сослуживцами у меня не завязались. В

шахте я восхищался забойщиками и проходчиками, а на поверхности они надо мной посмеивались[. . .

. . .]был суровый тридцатый год. Год сплошной коллективизации, начало первой пятилетки. 5

In 1933 Grossman left the Donbass and took up the post of laboratory head in a pencil factory in Moscow. Like Chekhov, one of his literary idols, he was suffering from tuberculosis. Experiences gained in the Donbass provide the basis for a large part of Grossman's early work, and the influence of the industrial milieu remains strong in many of the characters and in much of the narrative detail which we find in his wartime and post-war writing.

While still in the Donbass Grossman had begun work on a novel based on the life of the miners. In 1933 he submitted the finished novel, entitled "Glyukauf!", ("Glück auf!") to Gorky for publication in his literary almanac, God XVII. The manuscript was rejected. In a letter to Grossman Gorky explained why:

Глюкауф очень хороший материал для повести. Но он плохо « смонтирован » густо засеял лишними словами, испорчен дидактикой автора. 6

Grossman rewrote the work which he always referred to as a novel and in 1934 "Glück auf!" was finally published. In April of the same year Grossman's first rasskaz, "In the Town of Berdichev" ("V gorode Berdicheve") was published in Literaturnaya gazeta.⁷ Shortly afterwards Gorky arranged a meeting with Grossman, which was a turning point in his life:

Эта встреча с Алексеем Максимовичом (5 мая 1934 года) в большей степени повлияла на дальнейший мой жизненный путь. В то время я еще не был литератором-профессионалом. Алексей Максимович посоветовал мне всецело перейти на литературный труд... 8

Between 1934 and 1936 Grossman wrote numerous rasskazy which appeared in two separate volumes entitled Happiness (Schast'ie; 1935) and Four Days; (Chetyre dnya; 1936). Eventually in 1937 Grossman joined the Union of Writers. In 1936 he began work on the long novel Stepan Kol'chugin (Stepan Kol'chugin; 1937-1940) which traces the lives of several characters, principally that of the eponymous hero, from the unrest caused by the Russo-Japanese War of 1905, to the

end of the first two years of World War One. Due to the German invasion the novel was never completed. However, in an interview, given to Izvestiya before the war, Grossman outlined his intentions for the final parts of the novel. Part V was to deal with the Revolution, while the sixth part was to be dedicated to the Communist International.⁹ Stepan Kol'chugin was well received by Soviet critics. It was, wrote one critic an, . . . 'эпопея социалистической революции'.¹⁰ Thus by the beginning of the forties Grossman had established himself as a moderately successful and apparently conventional writer.

Nevertheless, not everyone approved of Grossman's novel. From Semen Lipkin's recent memoir, we now know that no less a person than Stalin had erased Grossman's name from the list of nominees for the Stalin prize after the committee had unanimously selected him as the prime contender. According to Lipkin, Stalin called the novel 'меньшевистский'¹¹. Whether Stalin's displeasure was solely ideological, or whether he resented Grossman's popularity with the judges is not known. However, given his capacity for vindictiveness such antagonism was not to be taken lightly. Henceforth, Grossman was a marked man.

Grossman was called up in August 1941 and throughout the Great Fatherland War (Velikaya Otechestvennaya Voyna) served as a war correspondent for the army newspaper Red Star (Krasnaya zvezda). None of the horror and chaos which constitute modern war escaped his attention. On the Bryanskiy and Central fronts of the summer of 1941 Grossman witnessed the devastating psychological and military effects of the Wehrmacht's Blitzkrieg. In 1942 he retreated eastwards to the Volga from where he covered the Stalingrad battle, which culminated in the encirclement and surrender of Von Paulus's 6th Army. During the Red Army's advance through the Ukraine and Poland he described the misery and brutality of life under German occupation: deportations; mass reprisals; and above all the obscenity of the Holocaust, which many in West and East were reluctant to believe, despite the terrible evidence. He was present at the liberation of Kiev, Odessa, Minsk, Warsaw, Lublin, Schwerin and Poznan. Finally, in 1945 he entered Berlin with the victorious, exhausted Red Army.

Those who served with Grossman, those who knew him during the war,

all pay tribute to his bravery and devotion to duty. Lipkin set Grossman apart from others:

Храбрость Гроссмана была храбростью чернорабочего войны, солдата жестокой поэзии войны. В то время как его коллеги умудрялись каждый год, а то и два раза в году, одеваться в генеральских пошивочных, шинель Гроссмана „пришла в состояние полной изношенности". Вот в такой, залитой бензином, заляпанной грязью шинели он запомнился мне в Сталинграде. 12

With the occupation forces in Germany Grossman remained aloof from the, . . . 'стыдливые, дикие, происшествия' 13 of his fellows. He had a moral strength which was felt by all, and as Lipkin points out, . . . 'Попой боялись ее. 14 Grossman's magnanimity is evident in his reports from inside Germany. There is an unrelenting hatred for the Nazis, but there is boundless sorrow for Germany's physical and moral prostration. Reconciliation was very much on his mind.

The war made Grossman a household name and his contribution was recognised by the award of the Orders of the Red Banner and Red Star, and several medals, one of which was for bravery in battle (Za otvagu). Apart from his highly popular wartime ocherki - the Stalingrad cycle are outstanding - Grossman also made a significant contribution to Soviet war literature with a number of povesti and rasskazy. The People are Immortal (Narod besmertn; 1942), The Old Teacher (Staryy uchitel'; 1942), and Life (Zhizn'; 1943) stand out among the vast flood of schematised and often crudely propagandistic war literature written between 1941 and 1945.

Stalingrad dominates Grossman's war prose, and in 1943 he commenced work on a long novel, dedicated to the battle, For a Just Cause (Za pravoe delo; 1952), which was eventually published in Novyy mir in the latter half of 1952. Grossman's masterpiece, Zhizn'i sud'ba, forms the narrative, chronological and philosophical sequel to Za pravoe delo. Together they provide the most complete picture of the Stalingrad battle in Soviet war literature.

One aspect of Grossman's war literature which is hardly discussed - even in the Gorbachev era - concerns his contribution to The Black Book (Chernaya kniga). The reason for this lies in the book's specifically Jewish aspect. Chernaya kniga was designed to be an

exposé of German war crimes carried out against the Jewish people.

As a war correspondent Grossman had seen ample evidence of Hitler's Endlösung. Indeed he was the first Allied war correspondent to describe in great detail the workings of the death camps in the report, The Hell of Treblinka (Treblinskiy ad; 1944). It was undoubtedly Grossman's painstaking attention to detail, the clinical accuracy of his reporting, which led to the submission of Treblinskiy ad as evidence for the prosecution at the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials. Thus, Grossman was ideally suited to assist in the preparation of the Chernaya kniga, and on the 2nd April 1944 joined its editorial committee alongside I'lya Ehrenburg. Between 1944-46 Grossman and Ehrenburg collected a huge amount of material. However, the book never saw the light of day in the Soviet Union. Ready for printing in 1948, its plates were destroyed at the last minute. Nevertheless, the manuscripts survived and on this basis Chernaya kniga was reconstituted and published in Russian by the Jerusalem publishers Tarbut in 1980. 15

The war years mark the apogee of Grossman's popularity and success. It was not to last, at least not with officialdom. In 1946 after the publication of his unusual play "If You Believe the Pythagoreans" ("Esli verit' pifagoreytsam"; 1946) in the journal Znamya, Grossman was subjected to scathing criticism in the Party press. One of many victims, Grossman's tribulations passed unnoticed in the West. Attacks of this nature were common at this time. The Zhdanovshchina, which demanded strict conformity in the arts, was well under way, and the slightest deviation from the Party's canon invited immediate censure.

Between 1952-53 Grossman came under renewed attack after the publication of Za pravoe delo. However, initial critical responses had been favourable and among the more astute and percipient the impact of the novel was considerable. To quote Simen Lipkin:

Впечатление от романа было огромное, как в литературной, так и в интеллигентных слоях читателей, истосковавшихся по правдивому и поэтическому слову. Не забудем, что роман печатался в годы одичания общества, когда борьба с космополитизмом довершала медленное вырождение литературы и искусства. 16

However, public statements of approval quickly became irrelevant.

Inspired no doubt by the virulent campaign of anti-Semitism, associated with the Doctors' plot, Soviet critics and fellow writers lambasted Grossman and his novel from all sides.

Extracts of the novel had been already been published in August 1946 and then again between April 1948 and September 1949. Thus, Grossman had every reason to believe that the finished manuscript would be acceptable to the editorial board of Novyy mir. Yet even before the public campaign of vilification, Grossman encountered difficulties. Konstantin Simonov, the then editor of Novyy mir, rejected the novel outright. Luckily for Grossman the composition of the editorial board changed and control of Novyy mir passed to Tvardovskiy, who, recognising the novel's importance, decided to publish it. It should be noted that Sholokhov, then a member of the editorial board, shared Simonov's reaction. He was firmly against publication. His reply to Tvardovskiy was blunt:

Кому вы поручили писать о Сталинграде?

В своем ли вы уме? Я против. 17

One can only agree with Lipkin that such an approach to literature was, . . . 'дикое, департаментское'.¹⁸ Clearly, Sholokhov's hostility to literary freedom was already well entrenched before the trial of Daniel and Sinyavsky.

However, in the contemporary, ideological climate Sholokhov's answer was not unexpected, and was reflected in the changes, which Grossman was to make before publication. The original title "Stalingrad" was to be changed, so as to avoid any impression that Grossman had personally taken it upon himself to write about the battle. As Lipkin has observed:

в эпоху борьбы с космополитизмом подтекст был ясен.¹⁹ The title which was decided upon - Za pravoe delo - appears innocent enough. It refers to Molotov's speech addressed to the Soviet people on the first day of the war, a speech, which Stalin as vozhd', should, by rights, have made himself. Whether by design or by accident, the title drew attention to Stalin's failure to address the nation sooner than he did. Moreover, it should not have been necessary to emphasise the just nature of the cause; it should have been self-evident. That it was not betrays the Soviet leadership's awareness of their own 'guilt' and incompetence. G. Svirskiy²⁰ has

suggested that Stalin personally ordered the campaign against Grossman in 1952-53. Given Stalin's personal intervention in the case of Stepan Kol'chugin's nomination for the Stalin prize and his portrayal in Za pravoe delo, . . . 'без общепринятых космогонических сравнений' 21, this suggestion would seem to have some substance.

The campaign against Grossman was intense. Lipkin, having read Bubennov's article, 22 one of the more vicious diatribes aimed at Grossman, recalls that the situation looked very ominous, . . . 'Это пахло тюрьмой, может быть, смертью. 23 Even Tvardovskiy and Fadeev who had steadfastly supported publication, now abandoned Grossman. Both publicly renounced their previous support and Tvardovskiy expressed regrets that he had permitted publication in Novyy mir. 24 Pressure was put on Grossman by Fadeev to renounce his novel publicly, something, which Grossman refused to do. Only after Stalin's death on March 5th 1953 did these attacks peter out. Isolated, vulnerable and abandoned by all but his closest friends, Grossman was to recall this as a difficult and trying episode in his life:

Мог ли я представить, живя в Донбассе, в пустом, семейном балагане на шахте Смолянке II, что тоска и одиночество, еще более сильные, чем в пору моей донбасской жизни, могут охватить меня здесь, в Москве, в кругу семьи, окруженного друзьями, среди любимых книг, занятого своей работой. 25

By one of the many erratic and wholly unpredictable events which shape Soviet society, Grossman's fortunes improved after Stalin's death. At the second Congress of Writers, convened twenty years after the first, Fadeev withdrew his earlier remarks concerning Za pravoe delo. Grossman seems to have harboured no lasting grudge. Thereafter Fadeev's decline was rapid, ending in suicide in 1956; a man for whom the burden of living the lie finally proved too much.

But towards Tvardovskiy there was bitterness, as is clear in a letter which Grossman wrote to Lipkin in September 1956:

Взял в архиве стенограмму Президиума, где Фадеев делал доклад обо мне. Прочел все выступления. Самое тяжелое чувство вызвала у меня речь Твардовского. Ты знаешь, прошло три года, я растерялся, читая его речь. Не думал я, что он мог так выступить. Он умнее других, ум позволил ему быть хуже, подлее остальных. Ничтожный он, хоть с умом и

талантом. 26

This residual antipathy was to influence Grossman four years later - with unforeseen consequences.

Other signs indicated Grossman's return to favour. In October 1954 the publishing house Voengiz brought out a limited edition of Za pravoe delo, which was followed up in 1955 with a mass circulation reprint. On his fiftieth birthday Grossman was awarded the Red Banner of Labour for his services to Soviet literature. In the citation it was noted that Grossman:

. . . 'более двадцати лет неустанно и плодотворно работает на благо советской литературы. 27

One can only agree with Shimon Markish's assessment of the outcome of the sordid and cowardly campaign, intended to destroy Grossman:

The party punished, the party forgave, and the person who got spat on was expected to wipe his face and pretend that nothing had happened. 28

Grossman began work on Zhizn' i sud'ba while Stalin was still alive. In July 1960 after a decade of relentless endeavour his masterpiece was completed. Yet completion brought no sense of elation. There are doubts natural enough for any author, but there is foreboding, which as subsequent events proved, was justified. In a letter to Lipkin dated 24th October 1959 Grossman writes:

Я не переживаю радости, подъема, волнений. Но чувство хоть смутное, тревожное, озабоченное, а уж очень серьезное оказалось. Прав ли я ? Это первое, главное. Прав ли перед людьми, значит, и перед Богом? А дальше уж второе, писательское - справился ли ? А дальше уж третье - ее судьба, дорога. Но вот сейчас я как-то очень чувствую, что это третье, судьба книги от меня отделяется в эти дни. Она осуществит себя помимо меня, отдельно от меня, меня уже не может быть. 29

Lipkin, already familiar with many of the characters and thrust of Zhizn' i sud'ba read the finished work. It should also be pointed out that short extracts of the novel had appeared in various magazines and papers; enough to arouse the readers' expectations, but insufficient material to attract the unwelcome attentions of the KGB. One extract was published in Vechernyaya Moskva, another in Literaturnaya gazeta.

In addition Grossman gave an interview to the military magazine , Sovetskiy voyn, in which he discussed his progress on Zhizn' i sud'ba.³⁰ Thus, we have no reason to doubt Nataliya Roskina's claim that, . . . 'Роман уже был широко известен'.³¹

But for Lipkin, and later Tvardovskiy, the question of publication was never a serious possibility. Both were convinced that no Soviet journal would touch Zhizn' i sud'ba. Undeterred, Grossman submitted the manuscript to Vadim Kozhevnikov, then the editor of Znamya in October 1960. For some time Kozhevnikov had been pressing Grossman for the manuscripts, little suspecting what was about to land on his desk. L. Anninskiy, a junior member of Znamya at the time , recollects the consternation and excitement caused by Grossman's novel. Aware of the decision arrived at by Kozhevnikov and his two sub-editors, Lyudmila Skorino and Alexander Krivitskiy, one of Anninskiy's colleagues, took the forbidden manuscripts home in a desperate attempt to read them before they disappeared for good.³² Increasingly alarmed by the delayed response from Znamya, Grossman sought a meeting with the editorial board. He learned that Znamya would not publish the novel and, moreover that the editorial board had unanimously condemned the novel as anti-Soviet.³³

In February 1961 the Soviet state inflicted its most crushing blow: the novel was 'arrested'. Two members of the KGB presented themselves at Grossman's flat on Begovaya street with a warrant for the arrest of the novel. The search was systematic and thorough. All remaining copies were seized, including the one at the offices of Znamya, and the other at Tvardovskiy's Novyy mir. The decision to offer the novel first to Kozhevnikov, rather than to Tvardovskiy - the legacy of Tvardovskiy's renunciation of Za pravoe delo - had borne bitter fruit. Rough drafts, typing equipment and carbon paper were all seized. Ironically a copy of Vse techet - the first draft - was left untouched.

Grossman's displeasure with Tvardovskiy was not the sole factor which led him to choose Znamya in preference to Novyy mir. Kozhevnikov had agreed to publish Grossman's rasskaz "Tirgarten" ("Tirgarten"; 1966) but the censor refused, having identified certain parallels between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. The parallels do exist and the story remained unpublished

until 1966.³⁴ According to Lipkin, Grossman felt that Kozhevnikov's determination to publish "Tirgarten" was genuine. Thus, reasoned Grossman, he would be more likely to publish a work in which the parallels with Nazi Germany were far more explicit. The literary censor at Znamya was not alone in his assessment of "Tirgarten". Earlier, Emmanuel Kazakevich, the editor of Literaturnaya Moskva, had rejected it. He, too, perceived the story's ambiguity:

. . . 'Казакевич не без основания усмотрел в "Тиргартене" ту зеркальность, которая побуждала бы читателей думать о сходстве двух режимов.³⁵

The arrest of the novel, the fruits of ten years work, was a personal catastrophe for Grossman. His earlier forebodings had proved to be all too well-founded. Even the campaign against Za pravoe delo does not seem to have shaken Grossman as badly as the arrest of Zhizn' i sud'ba. As Lipkin recalls:

Когда в 1953 году ударили по роману « За правое дело » когда мы каждый день ждали ареста, когда была реальная опасность, что Гроссмана приобщат к делу врачей-убийц, он был менее подавлен, чем сейчас.³⁶

As Grossman told Boris Yampolskiy, he had been 'hanged in his own doorway'.³⁷

The arrest of Zhizn' i sud'ba was more than a personal catastrophe for its author, it was of course a grave loss for Soviet literature in the 60s. We can only speculate as to the impact on Soviet literature, and even Soviet society, had Zhizn' i sud'ba been published in 1961, though certainly the repercussions would have been immense. To quote Vladimir Voynovich:

Если бы этот роман был опубликован в то время, когда был закончен, т.е. в 1960 году, он (я в этом не сомневаюсь) стал бы литературной сенсацией мирового значения.³⁸

The Soviet critic, Igor' Zolotusskiy, endorses this view:

Появись он в 1960 году - тогда, когда и был написан, - он продвинул бы наши представления об эпохе и о войне на десятилетия вперед. Потому что то, что мы знаем и понимаем сейчас, понимал в 1960 году Гроссман. Он и понимал больше. Его роман опережает даже самые смелые мысли нашего времени.³⁹

Grossman pursued numerous avenues in an attempt to secure the release of the manuscripts. He turned to D. A. Polikarpov, a former member of the Writers' Union's administrative body, and now responsible for matters of culture in the Central Committee. Polikarpov was blunt and abrasive. Unwilling to compromise himself, he suggested that Grossman discuss the matter with the heads of the Union of Writers, specifically Markov, Sartakov and Shipachev. In certain respects their assessment of the novel was not as harsh as that of Znamya's editorial board; in others it was worse. They conceded that much of what Grossman had written was true, but to publish the novel at such a time would be harmful to the state. Markov or Sartakov suggested that publication might be a possibility 250 years later.

Abandoning any further idea of help from the pusillanimous Union of Writers, Grossman wrote to Khrushchev. Grossman's letter is dignified, reasonable and conciliatory, but there are no regrets. He stands by what he has written in Zhizn' i sud'ba:

Я писал в своей книге то, что считал и продолжаю считать
правдой, писал лишь то, что продумал, прочувствовал,
перестрадал. 40

Grossman attempted to play down some of the work's harsher conclusions. He insisted that Zhizn' i sud'ba is not a, . . .
'политическая книга' 41, arguing that the work is essentially concerned with the war. Grossman's claim hardly needs challenging. Zhizn' i sud'ba destroys many of Soviet society's most hallowed beliefs and taboos. Nor is it confined to the war; it addresses some of the key questions of the twentieth century, and thus pertains to the heart of the human condition.

In his letter Grossman refers to the 20th Party Congress, an allusion to Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin. Grossman avers that Zhizn' i sud'ba is part of this process:

... 'книга « Жизнь и судьба » не противоречит той правде,
которая была сказана Вами, что правда стала достоянием
сегодняшнего дня, и не откладывается на 250 лет. 42

This represents a clear challenge to the sincerity and commitment of Khrushchev to reveal the truth about Stalin and to ensure some semblance of legality, a point which is underlined by the methods used

by the state to acquire Grossman's manuscripts. As Grossman himself has noted, these are not the methods used against falsehood and slander: 'Так борются против правды'.⁴³ How, he asks, can one understand such behaviour in the light of the ideas promulgated at the 22nd Party Congress (1961) ?

Grossman's letter is also interesting for the further light it sheds on the response of Znamya. Having rejected the novel, the editorial board advised Grossman to answer any enquiries from readers - it will be recalled extracts of Zhizn' i sud'ba had already been published - as to the novel's progress by saying that work on it had been delayed. Once again a tissue of lies was being drawn around the novel, and the author himself was expected to be compliant in consigning his own work to oblivion.

Rejection of the aesthetic criteria of socialist realism is implied by Grossman. He cites Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy and Chekhov as the paradigms of serious artistic endeavour. Their literary achievements are the criteria by which Zhizn' i sud'ba should be judged. The title, too, is suggestive of some of the great works of the nineteenth century with the deliberate use of antithesis. Voyna i mir, Otsy i deti, and Prestuplenie i nakazanie readily spring to mind. Grossman leaves us in no doubt that the title of Zhizn' i sud'ba was selected with this tradition in mind. Asked by Lipkin what the sequel to Za pravoe delo would be called, Grossman replied:

Как учит русская традиция, между двумя словами должен
стоять союз "и".⁴⁴

Grossman modestly admits that he may not reach the standards of his illustrious predecessors, but as he makes it clear, the question is not one of the artistic merits of Zhizn' i sud'ba, it is one of the authorial independence, . . . 'в праве писать правду'.⁴⁵

Lenin's name is also invoked, suggesting, in effect, that the publication of Zhizn' i sud'ba is not inconsistent with Lenin's, . . . 'нормы демократии'.⁴⁶ This is a tactical ploy on Grossman's part. While Zhizn' i sud'ba lacks the all out assault on Lenin which we find in Vse techet there are several places in the text where Lenin is directly indicted as the destroyer of Russia's freedom, one of many reasons why Zhizn' i sud'ba remained unpublished. Moreover, the concepts of freedom and democracy which emerge in Zhizn' i sud'ba

have nothing in common with Lenin's materialist view of history; they are spiritual and elusive, yet common to all men. 'Norms of democracy' is the duplicitous and specious language of the party theorists. It enables them to compartmentalise and control freedom. Such language does not belong to Grossman. He is in revolt against the empty slogan and meaningless cliché. His use of 'party speak' on this occasion represents a doomed attempt to find a common language between the defenders and enemies of freedom.

Grossman's letter to Khrushchev resulted in a summons from Suslov. The meeting lasted three hours. After the meeting Grossman wrote a detailed account from memory which ran to one hundred pages. Only one copy is known to exist and after Grossman's death his wife passed it on to the spetskhran of the Central State Archive of Literature and Art (TsGALI); much to the approval of the secretary of the Moscow section of the Union of Writers, the police general V. N. Il'in. There it remains. One can only hope that at some stage this invaluable record of what was discussed by the unrepentant heretic and the 'серый кардинал' 47 will be published.

Lipkin provides some insights into the nature of this conversation. However, the details are fragmentary. Suslov said that the Party valued such works of Grossman as Narod bessmertn and his wartime sketches. But he endorsed the opinion of those who had read Zhizn' i sud'ba that publication would be harmful to the Soviet Union. Echoing the words of either Markov or Sartakov, he said that the work might be published in another 250-300 years. Crucially important for Grossman, however, he dismissed outright any suggestion of the novel being returned to its creator. As a consolation Suslov promised to arrange the publication of a five volume set of Grossman's works. The promise was not kept.

Events in the international arena were not propitious either and may well have been a contributory factor in inducing the harsh response towards Grossman and his novel. International considerations had been important at the time of the Doctors' plot which to a large extent determined the response to Za pravoe delo. There is every reason to believe too that the authorities wanted to avoid any scandal similar to that which surrounded the publication of Pasternak's Dr Zhivago. This certainly would have been detrimental to Soviet

interests. Throughout the summer of 1961 there was growing tension in Berlin, culminating in the erection of the Berlin Wall on the 13th August 1961. Relations with China were deteriorating and Adol Eichmann was put on trial in Tel-Aviv. This latter episode was particularly germane to Zhizn' i sud'ba. Given the publicity which attended Eichmann's trial, . . . 'a process of education for millions in the facts of mass murder'⁴⁸, the Soviet authorities would, no surprisingly, be reluctant to countenance the publication of a work in which Eichmann's anti-Semitism is so closely identified with that of the Soviet state.

The arrest of the author's work, instead of the author himself, is a bizarre and cruel anomaly even in the history of Russia's long suffering literature. It is a new development in the incessant battle between writer and state. Above all it reflects the power of Grossman's analysis; one which Suslov et al had good reason to fear. Bearing in mind the deeply subversive nature of Grossman's manuscripts, one wonders why they were not carefully destroyed, a possibility which Grossman raises in his letter to Khrushchev. That they were not incinerated does in one sense underline the inertia and inflexibility associated with Soviet bureaucracy: the seizure of manuscripts had become state property, to have destroyed them would have been an act of vandalism. Yet red tape obscures a more fundamental reason. Would it be overstating the case to argue that those charged with the censorship of art had probably never encountered anything like Zhizn' i sud'ba before? For those accustomed to the hack work of socialist realism this immense and profound study of life under Stalin must have been a severe shock. Grossman was indeed the, . . . 'летописец своего времени'.⁴⁹ He has seen what millions of Russians had also seen. He omitted nothing. It might be possible to delay official publication of this truth, but it could never be destroyed. The ideologues implicitly recognised and feared Bulgakov's maxim: 'Рукописи не горят'.

Nataliya Roskina⁵⁰ maintains that the arrest of Grossman's novel gave added impetus to the development of samizdat. Grossman's bitter experience made it quite clear that writers had to take steps to preserve their works for posterity. Moreover, during the attacks on Solzhenitsyn in the sixties Grossman's name, inter alia, became

symbol of the state's abuse of artists. In a letter to the secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU from Pavel Antokolskiy, in which the confiscation of Solzhenitsyn's manuscripts was discussed, Grossman was cited as a precedent:

It is even more horrible because only a few years ago the same thing happened with the manuscripts of the second part of the novel of the late Vasilii Grossman. Is this kind of seizure of our writers' manuscripts to become a legalised custom?⁵¹

Fortunately, at least one copy of Zhizn' i sud'ba escaped the clutches of the KGB and was smuggled to the West. Extracts were serialised in the journal Kontinent in the seventies.⁵² In 1980 the first full Russian version was published in Switzerland. Scholars of Russian literature owe an immense debt to Shimon Markish and Efim Etkind for the scrupulosity and dedication which they brought to bear in preparing the novel for publication.

Now, thanks to an addendum to Lipkin's memoir, we can acknowledge the contribution of others in this drama. Both Lipkin and E. V. Zabolotskaya warned Grossman to protect one copy of the novel. This Grossman did and it was given to Lipkin. At the end of 1974 Lipkin approached Voynovich. Having read the novel, Voynovich agreed to help. Assisted by Elena Bonner and Andrey Sakharov, Voynovich microfilmed the novel and brought it to the West. Voynovich's own role was made public by him at the Frankfurt book fair in 1984. What remained unknown until the publication of Lipkin's piece, was firstly the fact that it was he who had retained a copy of the novel, and secondly the participation of Bonner and Sakharov. One is reminded of Galileo's students, who, determined that the master's Discorsi should be known to the world, smuggled the work to Holland away from the Holy Inquisition.

The manner in which the novel was smuggled to the West accounts for certain lacunae in the Lausanne text. We have no reason to doubt Lipkin's explanation for this:

... 'когда роман был издан на русском языке, выяснилось, что по техническим причинам в нем оказались пропуски - иногда отдельных слов, фраз, иногда целых страниц.

Пропуски эти были результатом несовершенных фотоснимков

и ни в коем случае не касались идейного содержания романа. 53

Before his death Grossman was to have one more confrontation with the organs of censorship. Between early November 1961 and the new year of 1962 Grossman was in Armenia. He had been invited to assist the Armenian writer, Rachniy Kochar in preparing the Russian translation of a novel. This trip provides the basis for "Peace be to You!" ("Dobro vam!"; 1965), a fine piece of travel writing, richly endowed with sensitive and intuitive insights into the life and fate of the Armenian people. It is indeed Grossman's 'армянская поэма'. 54

Tvardovskiy accepted "Dobro vam!" for publication in Novyy mir. The censor was less sympathetic and insisted that certain passages highlighting Soviet anti-Semitism be deleted. Grossman refused to compromise and the work remained unpublished until 1965, when it appeared in the journal Literaturnaya Armeniya, without the passages to which the Moscow censorship objected. Publication of "Dobro vam!" in the censored form, was, as Lipkin admits, in direct contravention of Grossman's wishes. But he felt justified in ignoring Grossman's wishes, because, . . . 'такую прекрасную вещь не надо было прятать от читателей'. 55

After the publication of "Dobro vam!" in Armenia, Tvardovskiy was once again offered the text. On this occasion however he declined to accept it. Eventually "Dobro vam!" was published by Sovetskiy pisatel' in 1967, together with some of Grossman's rasskazy in a volume of the same name. The version was more severely censored, much worse than had been demanded by the original literary censor. What should be noted here is that it was writers, not professional censors, who implemented these changes.

By the end of 1962 it became clear to Grossman that he did not have long to live. Cancer was diagnosed and Grossman underwent an operation. In August 1963 he finished his last major work Vse techet, having substantially rewritten it. Grossman died on the 14th September 1964. Those who knew him intimately do not doubt that the arrest of Zhizn' i sud'ba was the decisive factor in his death. Lipkin is convinced of it, and Nataliya Roskina has written that he died from the, . . . 'рак затравленных'. 56

Despite the efforts of the first literary commission formed after Grossman's death to stimulate an interest in his work, he remained an

unknown quantity for both Soviet and Western readers throughout the Brezhnev years. Matters were not helped by the publication of Vse techet in the West, which despite its content was largely ignored. Two members of the commission, Boris Galin and Grigoriy Berezhko, wanted to send a letter to Literaturnaya gazeta, condemning . . . 'Гроссмана, и буржуазных писак, его хвалителей'.⁵⁷ Only in the Gorbachev era is Grossman at last receiving in the Soviet Union and abroad the attention which he so richly deserves.

Throughout 1987 signs of Grossman's impending rehabilitation began to mount, although strictly speaking he had never been entirely expunged from the ranks of officially approved writers. Even after the seizure of Zhizn' i sud'ba some of his work still continued to be published.⁵⁸ In 1970 A. G. Bocharov, a specialist in the field of Soviet war literature, published an informative monograph on Grossman. Moreover, it was almost impossible to discuss developments in Soviet war literature without at least some reference to Grossman's contribution. In April 1987 two stories written by Grossman in the sixties appeared in print for the first time.⁵⁹ Both contain themes germane to the campaign of perestroyka. "Phosphorous" ("Fosfor"; 1987) is an autobiographical fragment completed towards the end of Grossman's life. He recalls his circle of student friends, and those among them who disappeared in 1937. Typically, Grossman reproaches himself for indifference to their fate. Real friendship is shown by those in the camps. One of the inmates warns Grossman through a third party not to contact him in the camps, lest Grossman and the others are incriminated. As Grossman recalls, the request not to write moved him, but it also pleased him.

Discussion of privilege in "In the Great Ring" ("V bol'shom kol'tse"; 1987) and environmental degradation impart a particular topicality to this rasskaz. Superficially an account of family life, the story's apparent simplicity is only apparent. Through the eyes of a small child, Masha, Grossman draws a parallel between the privileged and the not so privileged living in Moscow in the early 60s. Masha lives with her parents in a luxury flat on the outskirts of Moscow. Her parents are successful academics, who enjoy the comfort and rewards which attend such status in the Soviet Union. Aware of the natural resentment of their less fortunate neighbours, Masha's parents

feel uncomfortable in their presence. The surrounding shanty town with its squalor and overcrowding is a glaring reminder that social and economic inequality exist on an unacceptably large scale in a society purporting to be classless and egalitarian.

1987 also saw the publication of further extracts from Grossman's wartime notebooks, a tantalizing fraction of some 305 known zapis⁶⁰. In October 1987 a short extract of Zhizn' i sud'ba was carried by Ogonyok 61 and following this it was reported in Literaturnaya gazeta that the Union of Writers had convened a second commission, chaired by A. A. Anan'ev, the chief editor of Oktyabr', to research Grossman's literary legacy.⁶² Judging by the inclusion of the critics, A. G. Bocharov, E. V. Kardin and L. I. Lazarev, in addition to the writers, G. Ya. Baklanov and V. L. Kondrat'ev, the Union of Writers views this commission as a serious and major undertaking. Finally, as if to confound the most intractable sceptics as they ponder glasnost' in the arts, Zhizn' i sud'ba was published in the first four issues of Oktyabr' for 1988.⁶³ One completely shares Efim Etkind's sense of disbelief at this momentous event:

Право, я легче бы поверил, если бы мне сказали, что
в СССР создана вторая легальная политическая партия.⁶⁴

Other texts, hitherto unpublished or disfigured by censorship were quick to follow. At the end of 1988 the unexpurgated version of "Dobro vam!" was published in Znamya 65 and some five months later a further selection of stories and one essay - also in Znamya 66 - came to the readers' attention for the first time. Nothing now seemed forbidden to the editors of Soviet journals and in June 1989, confirming the announcement made a year earlier, Vse techet appeared in Oktyabr'. Grossman's ghost had finally been laid to rest.

II

Among Western critics there is an overwhelming consensus of opinion that Grossman's wartime experiences provide the origins of the damning conclusions for Soviet orthodoxy expressed in both Zhizn' i sud'ba and Vse techet. In Germany critics have written of, . . . 'eine grundlegende Wandlung, die zur Revision seiner bisherigen Überzeugungen führte'⁶⁷, of, . . . 'ein Prozeß der Ernüchterung und des Umdenkens, der in der radikalen Absage an den Bolschewismus

kulminierte'68, and , . . .' eine radikale Infragestellung seiner revolutionären Überzeugung'.69 While in America it has been suggested that Grossman, . . . 'largely ignored the dark side of the Soviet system before the German invasion'.70 Shimon Markish, a Grossman specialist, endorses these assessments:

Я думаю, что дорога к поединку с советской властью началась для Гроссмана 22 июня 1941 года.71

Given the upheavals of 1941-45 such a conclusion is not unreasonable. Grossman's mother was murdered in the Berdichev ghetto and his fifteen year old stepson Misha was killed by a bomb in Chistopol.

Nevertheless, important as the war years undoubtedly are, they only provide part of the answer as to the origins of Grossman's heresy. The importance of the thirties cannot be overstated. Writing in Zhizn' i sud'ba, Grossman stresses that the reassessment of life in the Soviet Union, which took place in the war, began before 1941:

Процесс этот начался до войны, однако, он происходил, главным образом, не в сознании народа, а в его подсознании72

Three events served as the catalyst for what Grossman calls this 'переосмысливание'73 of Soviet life: collectivisation; industrialisation; and 1937. For Grossman there seems little doubt that the Stalinist terror embodied as it were in the perverse commandment 'thou shalt bear false witness' was his personal turning point. As he was to write in Vse techet: 'В начале было слово... Воистину так.74 It is to this pre-war period that we must turn if we are to understand fully the genesis of Grossman's heresy and its subsequent evolution.

Voynovich's appreciation of Grossman points us in this direction too:

Заурядным писателем Гроссман не был никогда и задолго до появления « Жизни и судьбы » все с большим трудом вписывался в советскую литературу. Но только в этой книге [Zhizn' i sud'ba] (а затем во « Все течет ») он раскрылся полностью.75

Furthermore, Voynovich makes the important observation that the path trodden by Grossman was a long one. Heresy, as opposed to criticism of selected features of a régime, is seldom characterised by sudden, revealing insights. It is a long process, one of self-doubt,

re-evaluation and inner struggle. For a writer such as Grossman it was a process in which not only the full force of his considerable intellect, but also his personal experience was brought to bear. While certain events are important - 1937, the war, the Holocaust, the Zhdanovshchina and Doctors' Plot - no single one explains satisfactorily the outcome of Grossman's intellectual life and his personal fate.

This reductionist approach is most pronounced in the attitude of Western critics and writers to the significance of the campaign against Grossman over the period 1952-53. They have concluded, wrongly in the opinion of this author, that this was the key event which separates Zhizn' i sud'ba and everything beyond it from Za pravoe delo and what came before. To a great extent this determines attitudes towards Za pravoe delo. According to the anonymous author of the preface, accompanying the Western, Russian language publication of Zhizn' i sud'ba, Za pravoe delo is:

. . . 'обыкновенный роман сталинской эпохи, его место -
в одном ряду с « Белой березой » Бубеннова и СИМОНОВСКИМИ
« Днями и ночами », но не с « Жизнью и судьбой ». 76

Even the most cursory reading of Simonov's and Bubennov's texts will demonstrate the weakness, and it must be said, a serious ignorance of Za pravoe delo, which this assessment reveals.

Yet others have endorsed it, in some cases going further. In his study of Grossman, M. J. Taylor claims that the subsequent book edition of Za pravoe delo is weaker still:

In literary terms the result is devastating. The novel
loses its power, any polemical aspects it may have are
neutered, its sense of reality is diluted. 77

In fact, as we shall see from this study both versions are inherently polemical, and in some respects, as a result of Stalin's death, the book version, more so. Robert Chandler, the English translator of Zhizn' i sud'ba, has joined the chorus of condemnation, adding that Za pravoe delo is, . . . 'deadened by its ideological conformity' 78, to which one can add Markish's far from encouraging views:

It is absurd to think that in the terrible year of 1952
someone would dare to praise a book that differed one iota
from the ideological and aesthetic standard of those in

power. And indeed For a Righteous Cause is a completely orthodox Soviet epic narrative.⁷⁹

Markish's emphatic assertion of the orthodox nature of Za pravoe delo cannot be sustained in the light of textual analysis. It is, too, very much at odds with his belief that the German invasion marks the beginning of Grossman's heresy. Eleven years after the war one would expect signs of such disaffection to be evident in Za pravoe delo - as indeed they are - even more so when we know from Grossman's letter to Khrushchev that he began writing Zhizn' i sud'ba in 1950. Yet Markish ignores this, suggesting therefore that the crisis for Grossman began during the period 1952-53, and not the 22nd June 1941. This is an obvious inconsistency for those who acknowledge the importance of the war in Grossman's transformation, but dismiss his first major post-war work, and above all its affinity with Zhizn' i sud'ba. It should also be noted that Za pravoe delo is not the only work of this period to merit such unwarranted criticism from Markish. "Abel The 6th August" ("Avel' shestoe avgusta"; 1953) and "Tirgarten" are, he argues, spoiled by, 'государственная идеология'.⁸⁰

By far the most robust and cogent defence of Za pravoe delo has come from Simeon Lipkin. Comparisons with Bubennov's Belaya bereza and Simonov's Dni i nochi are quite rightly rejected and attention is drawn to Grossman's earlier trials with officialdom; the disapproval of "The Ukraine without the Jews" ("Ukraina bez evreev"; 1943) and the attacks made on "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam". Similarly, any accusation of ideological conformity in Za pravoe delo is given short shrift:

За правое дело всей лексикой своей, всей музыкой, всей живописью, всем пристальным вниманием к таким подробностям быта...наконец, всем своеобразием, неуправляемостью истинного таланта было чуждо социалистическому реализму.⁸¹

Others recognised this too. An unnamed member of the Central Committee visited Grossman, and not without some admiration, commented on Grossman's insolence.⁸² Grossman broached subjects and themes in Za pravoe delo which before him very few Soviet authors had dared touch. It is no ordinary novel, and as Lipkin quite rightly points out:

И разве на обыкновенный советский роман обрушился бы столь

тяжелый удар, который чуть не уничтожили и « За правое дело» и самого автора ? 83

The prevailing atmosphere in the Soviet Union during the Doctors' Plot is not enough to account for the intensity of the vilification levelled at Grossman. We have to go deeper. Most important of all we cannot divorce Za pravoe delo from Zhizn' i sud'ba. To quote Lipkin:

Я настаиваю на том, что было бы неосторожно рассматривать « Жизнь и судьбу » только с точки зрения, что, мол, политические и философские взгляды автора изменились по сравнению с тем временем, когда он писал « За правое дело». Конечно, было и это, темные стороны действительности часто становятся источником света для сознания художника. « Жизнь и судьба » намного выше, намного важнее « За правое дело », но оба романа принадлежат одному и тому же таланту. 84

No question mark hangs over the differing merits and importance of the two works. But to disregard Za pravoe delo in our interpretation of Zhizn' i sud'ba would be a serious omission. The path to Zhizn' i sud'ba leads through Za pravoe delo, not around it.

Not surprisingly this question has occupied the minds of Soviet critics. Generally they support Lipkin. Za pravoe delo is, contends L. Anninskiy, 'прелюдия, экспозиция' 85 to Zhizn' i sud'ba and A. Bocharov has rejected the deliberate or ill-informed attempt on the part of some to separate the two novels, as if, he suggests, to indicate, . . . 'поворот автора чуть не на 180 градусов'. 86 In addition Bocharov sees the 20th Party Congress as a decisive factor for Zhizn' i sud'ba, particularly for the portrayal of Stalin. Evidence of the Stalin phenomenon is to be found in earlier works, albeit in a more guarded form. Nevertheless the 20th Party Congress certainly gave added impetus to Grossman's attempts to evaluate Stalin and Stalinism.

To date, Soviet criticism has shown no haste in reevaluating "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam", Grossman's wartime sketches, or his pre-war writing in the light of the Soviet publication of Zhizn' i sud'ba. Some critics, notably, A. Bocharov are hamstrung by what they have previously written about Grossman. To change their position now would be to reveal, if not a certain insincerity, then timidity and willing

compliance to the demands of the Brezhnev era, the period of zastoy, which is ceaselessly condemned and held up to be the very opposite of perestroyka.

The definitive Western or Soviet study of Grossman has yet to be written and in view of the extent to which some of the older generation of critics have been compromised, it is probably a task for a fresh mind, one free from ideological clutter and unimpeded by the past, and able to take advantage of the greater access to Soviet archives and contact between Western and Soviet scholars. Nor is there room for complacency in the West. Increasingly, as Zhizn' i sud'ba, Vse techet and Grossman's earlier writing come under more intense scrutiny, Western scholarship will have to reassess and redefine fundamentally its attitude to the place of Vasilii Grossman in the history of Soviet literature and thought. It is hoped that this study will make a modest contribution to this process.

III

In concluding this introduction some observations need to be made concerning texts. A large body of Grossman's writing, including some wartime works, but mainly those of the post-war era, have been subjected to rewriting and censorship. Changes are particularly apparent in the differences between the journal and subsequent book versions of Za pravoe delo. Numerous deletions and supplements create a number of problems for researchers. One needs to decide which of the two texts, journal or book, should be taken as the definitive text. For this study the policy adopted has been to regard, wherever possible, the definitive text as the one which draws upon both versions. When quoting from the work, the absence or modification of a given passage in another version will be indicated in the notes, and its significance discussed in context. Such an approach will maintain the momentum of the discussion and obviate the requirement for a separate chapter on textology and thus the risk of repetition.

With regard to Zhizn' i sud'ba the problem is of a different nature. To date there exist three Russian versions: the 1980 Swiss publication; a Soviet journal version published in Oktyabr'; and a Soviet book edition brought out by Knizhnaya palata at the end of 1988. Evidence of censorship can be detected in both Soviet versions.

In the journal version the most obvious deletion was the chapter on anti-Semitism, which corresponds to chapter 32, Part II in the Lausanne edition. In September of 1988 a letter to the editorial board from Viktor Koretskiy pointed this out and the missing chapter was included after his letter.⁸⁷ As to how Koretskiy knew of this deletion, and more importantly why it was not included in the relevant journal copy, one can only speculate. It may reflect some disagreement among the staff at Oktyabr' itself. Subsequently this chapter appeared in the book version. However, both journal and book versions are marred by further omissions for which there can be no legitimate excuse, especially in this age of glasnost'. The significance of these deletions will be discussed later.

Matters are further complicated by the fact that immediately before Knizhnaya palata brought out Zhizn' i sud'ba it was ascertained that Grossman's surviving stepson, Fedor Borisovich Guber, had acquired a copy of an original manuscript.⁸⁸ The manuscript had been kept by Grossman's friend, Vyacheslav Ivanovich Loboda, whose wife had passed it on after the publication of Zhizn' i sud'ba in Oktyabr'. According to Anna Samoylovna Berer⁸⁹ there can be no doubt as to the manuscript's authenticity. One suspects that the saga is not yet over. If, for example, the newly acquired manuscripts can fill the various lacunae in the Lausanne edition, then the final, definitive version of Zhizn' i sud'ba may well be published in the Soviet Union. For the foreseeable future, however, the Lausanne text will remain the most complete of the three extant versions and will serve as the basis for this study. As in the case of Za pravoe delo deletions will be cross-referenced to the three texts and discussed in context.

No serious problems arise with "Dobro vam!" or "Vse techet". Severely censored in 1967, "Dobro vam!" has at last been restored to its original state. The extent of censorship, done primarily, it will be recalled, by writers and not professional censors, is remarkable. For the extent to which it casts light on the insidious process of self-censorship it deserves a special study. A textual comparison of the Western and Soviet publications of "Vse techet" indicates no major differences in text. For reasons of access all quotations in this study refer to the Western publication.

The Changing Ethos of Soviet War Literature

Chapter II

I

From its inception the Soviet Union has been constantly and vitally concerned with questions regarding the prevention, interpretation and prosecution of war. Survival in what it sees as a hostile capitalist world, as much as the fact that the Soviet Union arose from the ruins of World War One, accounts for this. The role that war has played in the formation, consolidation and defence of the Soviet Union is reflected in a large part of its early literature. World War One, Intervention and the Civil War are the main themes for early writers. Texts such as: Serafimovich's The Iron Flood (Zheleznyy potok; 1924); Fadeev's The Rout (Razgrom; 1927); Furmanov's Chapaev (1923) and Sholokhov's great epic The Quiet Don (Tikhii don; 1928-1940) have become classics of socialist realism.

Confronted with the literature dedicated to The Great Fatherland War, one is struck by its sheer volume. Any explanation for this is obliged to go beyond the imperatives of ideology. That, over forty years after it ended, the war is still discussed and analysed, and that the volume of books, memoirs and articles on the theme, continues to expand relentlessly, bear witness to the unprecedented severity of the Russo-German conflict. For those fortunate enough not to have endured the horrors of Nazi occupation and the total disregard of civilised standards which applied on the Eastern front the statistics are perhaps too terrible to understand. With the fiftieth anniversary of the German invasion approaching the memory still remains strong, the scars deep, the consequences for Soviet society far-reaching. No other event in Soviet history commands such a mixture of horror, pride and numbing grief.

Proliferating diversity, volume, the long period over which it has been written, and the differing attitudes of successive Soviet leaders are some of the factors which complicate the classification and analysis of the changes which have taken place in Soviet war literature since 1941. To do it justice would require a separate

study. Thus, this chapter makes no claim to be a comprehensive or consistently detailed account of developments.¹ Instead it will seek to discuss general trends and the better known writers, while paying closer attention to those themes which are felt to be more relevant to our understanding of Grossman.

II

By and large Soviet wartime literature tends to be schematised and thematically limited. Writers saw themselves as an auxiliary arm of the Army. Repeatedly, their articles sought to portray the Germans as destroyers of Occidental civilization, to foster the belief in eventual victory and to stress the unity of party and people. These aims tell us as much about the fragmented nature of pre-war Soviet society as they do about the calamitous military situation.

Hatred of the Germans was nurtured and preached with a religious zeal. Mikhail Sholokhov's The Science of Hatred (Nauka nenavisti; 1942) is a typical example. The hero, Lieutenant Gerasimov, is captured by the Germans. In captivity he witnesses the Germans' brutal and sadistic treatment of Russian prisoners of war. Scenes of torture serve specific functions. They arouse hatred, and reinforce the opprobrium, taint of treachery and fear associated with capture. Moreover, they are indispensable for the psychological tempering of the Russian soldier. Bereft of humanly recognisable characteristics, demonic and endlessly bloodthirsty, the enemy is easier to kill. Such propaganda merely reinforced the experiences of millions. Blinded by racial policy and failing to exploit the widespread discontent which existed in their newly acquired empire, the Germans made their intentions towards the civilian population abundantly clear. No allowance is made for good Germans either. Senseless brutality is a national characteristic. All Germans are bad, none must be spared.

Certain German atrocities attracted more attention than others, lending themselves to skilful exploitation. Zoya Kosmodemianskaya, a member of the Komsomol, committed an act of sabotage in a village not far from Volokolamsk. Caught by the Germans, she was executed publicly. Overnight she became a national heroine, a paradigm of impeccable courage and virtue, whose fate and its message of self-sacrifice was brought home to Russians in poems and countless

newspaper articles.

Writers such as Aleksey Tolstoy and particularly Il'ya Ehrenburg concentrated upon Hitler, Fascism and the depraved nature of German culture. In often crude - but highly effective - journalistic sketches, they vilified and mocked everything German. People welcomed these articles which gave powerful expression to the deep loathing of the Germans and before Stalingrad to the sense of frustration and humiliation at the continuing military reversals. However, such understandable hatred raised serious questions. Was Fascism a true reflection of Germany? Or did Hitler and the Nazis represent a minority with little support? Few seemed bothered with such questions in the midst of the battle for national survival.

Despite attempts to tone this hate campaign down towards the end of the war - by this time Ehrenburg was becoming something of an embarrassment - the Soviet stance was entirely consistent with the view that German equals Fascist. This approach possesses a certain ruthless logic. The emotional appeal on which the hate campaign was based would be considerably weakened, if the soldier or civilian to whom the appeal was addressed, was compelled to make tortuous moral or ideological decisions as to the nature of Fascism. This is one reason perhaps why the Germans were invariably referred to in official propaganda as Fascists, and only rarely as Germans. Nevertheless, Soviet critics continue to insist that a firm distinction was drawn between the ideology of Fascism and the ordinary German, then and now; that the hate propaganda was directed solely at the German soldier. This studiously ignores the problems stated above. Alexander Werth, who spent a large part of the war in the Soviet Union perceives the heart of the matter:

There was the "ordinary Fritz" of 1944 and there were the thousands of Himmler's professional murderers; but was there a clear dividing line between the two? 2

A revealing insight into Soviet attitudes can be found in a discussion of Viktor Nekrasov's "The Second Night" ("Vtoraya noch'; 1962). On a reconnaissance mission a Russian soldier stumbles across a German [nemetskiy] soldier. In the ensuing struggle the Fascist [fashist] is killed.³ In essence the terms are synonymous, and if a literary critic, writing twenty years after the war, can

regard them as such, one can hardly expect greater exactitude from the ordinary Soviet citizen during or after the war. The discussion of Fascism and the problems it raises is an excellent instance of an apparently straightforward wartime label becoming increasingly problematical and complex after 1945. In the post-war period Baklanov, Bykov, Grossman, Genatulin and many others have shown dissatisfaction with the traditional view of Fascism.

Poetry proved itself to be especially suitable to the orchestration of hatred. Good examples of this are Konstantin Simonov's "Kill him" ("Ubey ego; 1942) and Aleksey Surkov's "Oath of a Warrior" ("Klyatva voyna"; 1941), "Blood Oath" ("Klyatva nad krov'yu"; 1942) and "The Avengers' Commandment" ("Zapoved' mstiteley"; 1942). No details are spared in Surkov's poems. They speak of the Russian people's suffering and the desperate longing for revenge:

Мы знаем ужас черных пустырей
На месте сел, поселков и предместий.
Нет! Слезы всех фашистских матерей
Не тронут сердце, жаждущее мести. 4

Hatred of the German invader is preached alongside fervent patriotism. Indeed, patriotism and the need to focus Russian public opinion on the dangers of capitalist encirclement had been a major theme of official propaganda in the thirties. It became crucial in wartime, and was clearly evident in the official term for the war, The Great Fatherland War. Wartime patriotism drew much of its force from its appeal to the pre-Soviet past. Stalin's wartime speeches, often coinciding with critical moments on the battlefield, are rich in such allusions. In his address to the troops assembled on Red Square on 7th November 1941, he stresses an unbroken lineage from Alexander Nevskiy, Dmitriy Donskoy and Suvorov. Every aspect of Russia's past - from its great military leaders to its religious heritage - was invoked to legitimise the struggle.

Spontaneous and deeply felt emotions of love towards their country and everything Russian were expressed in poetry. What these poems, many thousands of them, lacked in artistic achievement, they made up for in sincerity. There can be no doubt that their quasi-religiosity, their almost mystical quality struck a chord in the national psyche. Arguably the most famous poem of the war, and printed literally in

millions was Simonov's "Wait for me"; ("Zhdi menya"; 1941). Simonov's imagery is simple. He speaks of the yearning to be home, of work, rest and of the unbreakable bonds of love which will triumph over separation, privation and even death. The title, repeated like a liturgical chant, reinforces the poem's central message, one of hope. Born in the irrational, it seeks to challenge and overcome unbearable reality by the power of belief and the strength of emotion.

Patriotic fervour gained in intensity after the German collapse at Stalingrad in February 1943. It achieved its most explicit official approval in 1945. During a reception in the Kremlin on 24.05.1945 given in honour of senior Soviet Army commanders, Stalin paid tribute to the valour and fortitude of the Soviet people, but singled out the Russians for special praise.⁵ Increasingly after 1945 Russian patriotism became xenophobic and was a distinct feature of both the Zhdanovshchina and Doctors' Plot.

Ideological contradictions inherent in concepts such as Russian nationalism or Soviet patriotism were disregarded between 1941-45. Defeating Hitler was all important. However after the war this legacy could not so easily be ignored. It is worth considering how Soviet ideology has attempted to overcome this problem.

In general terms, four forms of devotion to one's country are identified in the Soviet canon.⁶ Patriotism is entirely positive and is used exclusively in reference to the Soviet Union. Nationalism consists in a mystical devotion to one's fatherland and the supremacy of the state over the individual. Chauvinism is regarded as an extreme form of nationalism. Finally, there exists Socialist Internationalism which identifies the interests of Russian patriotism with those of the international working class.

It will be quite obvious that the practical manifestation of patriotism in the Soviet Union is nearer to its own definition of nationalism, or even chauvinism, than to the apparently benign patriotism mentioned above. Mystical devotion to one's country was, and still is a major feature of Soviet patriotism. Compare the term Great Fatherland War with the rather innocuous, Second World War, used by the Western Allies, the very states accused of exaggerated nationalism and chauvinism. Moreover, the striving for political independence which Soviet ideologues equate with nationalism has

little to distinguish itself from Stalin's formula "Socialism in one country".

The war on the Eastern front was remarkable for the size of its operational area, the huge number of combatants and non-combatants involved and the extremes of climate. This partly accounts for the diversity of theme and experience which we find in Soviet war literature.

The siege of Leningrad is a case in point. A siege without parallel in modern times, it has produced its own distinct brand of literature. Poetry features prominently and Ol'ga Berggol'ts, Vera Inber, Anna Akhmatova and Nikolay Tikhonov played a vital role in sustaining Leningrad's spirit of defiance. Ol'ga Berggol'ts typifies the change in response of many intellectuals towards Stalin and the regime which the war had brought about. Stalin is distrusted, but the fate of the nation demands unity. This is precisely the problem which faced Grossman at the outbreak of war. Berggol'ts spoke for a great many when shortly after the German invasion she wrote:

Я и в этот день не позабыла
горьких лет гонения и зла,⁷

Like the most successful wartime poetry Berggol'ts's poems are painfully lucid and free from superfluous metaphor and abstraction. Many suggest diary entries in verse. They are intimate, yet immediately recognisable as those sufferings shared by all.

Fortitude, the extreme cold and above all hunger are the main themes of the Leningrad writers and poets. In her long narrative poem "The Pulkovo Meridian" ("Pulkovskiy meridian"; 1941-43), which won a Stalin prize, Vera Inber gives new meaning to our accustomed perception of hunger. Hunger and cold breed desperation. Malnutrition and dystrophy, the hallmarks of Leningrad's inhabitants, become literally and metaphorically the fate of Leningrad itself as it is stripped of all wood:

Полусгоревшие дома - калеки,
Остатки перекрытий и столбов
Все рубят для печурок и гробов.⁸

Like Leningrad, the peculiarities of Stalingrad gave rise to a distinctive body of literature. Stalingrad marks the first major triumph of Russian arms on the Eastern front, and this alone would be

sufficient to ensure that it received the attention of writers. Nevertheless, those writers who have written about the battle have made a substantial contribution to the development of Soviet war literature. Among the better known works and authors are: Konstantin Simonov's Days and Nights (Dni i nochi; 1944); Viktor Nekrasov's In the Trenches of Stalingrad (V okopakh Stalingrada; 1946); Sholokhov's The Fate of a Man (Sud'ba cheloveka; 1957), not to mention the works of Grossman.

Their military significance apart, Leningrad and Stalingrad were symbolically important too. Leningrad was the cradle of the Revolution and bore Lenin's name, while Stalingrad was named after his disciple; facts not lost on Hitler. More importantly they epitomised a solidarity in suffering. Ol'ga Berggol'ts wrote of them as two brothers.⁹ Useful during the war, this sense of solidarity and particularly the self-esteem felt in Leningrad, seem to have angered Stalin. In 1949 the museum commemorating the blockade was closed down.

By the late summer of 1942 vast areas of Russian territory lay under German control. German lines of communication were stretched and the immense task of policing these territories offered excellent opportunities for partisans. Partisan warfare has an impressive historical and revolutionary heritage. It appealed to the conspiratorial mentality of many Bolsheviks and seemed to offer a cost effective way of hitting back when little else was going the Russians' way. Stalin, the supreme opportunist, was quick to seize these advantages. In his first wartime speech¹⁰ made to a bewildered and frightened nation, he called upon those living in the occupied areas to form partisan detachments and sabotage squads. Exactly how those living under German occupation were to acquire the necessary arms and other equipment, let alone find the will, in the summer of 1941, was not made clear. In 1941 partisan activity was sporadic, uncoordinated and thus largely ineffective. It had little more than nuisance value.

Nevertheless, adept use of propaganda and mythical partisans helped to create the illusion of an official Soviet presence. Later in the war, as experience was gained and equipment became available, Soviet partisans did indeed exert considerable pressure on the German supply lines. In addition, they made a special point of killing the

starostas, appointed by the Germans to administer the occupied territories. This aspect of occupation is important, since revenge is one of the dominant motifs of partisan warfare in Soviet literature, at times verging on a psychopathic obsession. In fact one might go so far as to say that the driving force for partisan warfare is revenge. Large scale deportations, destruction of homes and brutal and arbitrary German rule provided powerful incentives to kill Germans and hamper Germany's war effort. However the sustained close contact of the Germans and the indigenous peoples did not always, despite official Soviet claims to the contrary, lead to implacable resistance. Values and standards of behaviour were mutually absorbed. Many actively collaborated with the Germans and played a leading role in helping their masters and their Einsatzgruppen expedite the Final Solution in the occupied territories. Cases of collaboration are well documented in Anatoliy Kuznetsov's Babiy yar (Babiy yar; 1966).

The special nature of partisan warfare with its contradictions and distortions has been penetratingly analysed by the outstanding Belorussian writer Vasil' Bykov. Sotnikov (Sotnikov; 1970), The Obelisk (Obelisk; 1971) and The Wolf Pack (Volch'ya staya; 1975) are harrowing accounts of men and women in desperate situations confronted by apparently insoluble moral dilemmas. No glamour is to be found in Bykov's stories. Outnumbered by the Germans, victims of treachery, cowardice and cruelty on their own side, the partisans wage a very unequal struggle. The popular view that the partisans were always wiser, more cunning and generally morally worthier than their German antagonists remains unvindicated in Bykov. Many of his characters hover on the brink of psychological collapse, and on one level it is possible to see his stories as studies of extreme mental states, as laboratories of the mind.

Since its very essence was the . . . 'defiance of authority'¹¹, partisan warfare posed dangers for Soviet power. Some partisan units had fought independently for nearly three years by the time the Red Army returned. During that time they had become fiercely self-reliant - they had to be in order to survive - and naturally, they resented the reimposition of centralised control. This independence posed a threat to the regime. Nor was this problem confined to the partisans. Isolated groups of soldiers, those engaged in dangerous and lonely

missions beyond the immediate restrictions of military rule, such as snipers, scouts and small sub-units took great pride in their hard won military skills. Their distinct brand of comradeship was characterised by intense loyalty and hostility to all outsiders. Good examples of this mentality in conventional military formations are found in Emmanuel Kazakevich's excellent The Star (Zvezda; 1946) and much of Grossman's prose.

An illustration of the Party's determination to reshape perceptions of the partisan campaign can be seen in the fate of Alexander Fadeev's novel The Young Guard (Molodaya gvardiya; 1945). A group of teenagers in the Krasnodar region organise themselves into an effective resistance movement against the Germans, but with minimal assistance from the Party. This was the problem. Fadeev rewrote the novel, stressing the Party's guiding and inspirational role in resistance to the Germans. Since 1945 the Party has sought to appropriate for itself the achievements of partisan warfare; and the exploits of Soviet partisans, real or imagined, occupy an important place in military-patriotic education.

The German invasion stunned the Soviet leadership and population. The inability of the Red Army to stop the Germans, and Stalin's failure immediately to rally the nation cast grave doubts on the regime's competence. German military success completely contradicted the flood of pre-war propaganda in which the myth of Soviet invincibility was carefully cultivated. Writing before the war, Fadeev asserted that socialist realism was more than just a literary doctrine; it provided a framework in which it was possible to depict the activity of those enemies inside and outside the Soviet Union who were determined to destroy the new world.¹² Portrayals of war based on esoteric literary theory and not on the conceivable outcome proved useless. Anatoliy Shpanov's novel The First Blow (Pervyy udar; 1939) illustrates the point well. A hopelessly idealized account of a Russo-German war, it bore no resemblance to what actually took place between 1941 and 1945. The bitter irony and harsh disparity between dream and reality are not lost on one of Simonov's characters in The Living and the Dead (Zhivye i mertvye; 1959), who in headlong retreat angrily recalls Shpanov's novel:

И с яростью вспомнил прочитанный два года тому назад

роман о будущей войне, в котором от первого же удара наших самолетов сразу разметалась в пух и прах вся фашистская Германия. Этого бы автора две недели назад на Бобруйское шоссе! 13

In Zhivye i mertvye Simonov goes some way to address the debacle of the early months of the war and his account remains one of the better ones.

The trauma of 1941 and the question of final culpability is a major theme in Soviet war literature and historiography. During Stalin's lifetime serious analysis of this controversial subject was not possible. Circumstances more propitious for reliable scholarship ensued after 1956. Two important landmarks were the publication in 1965 of the official six volume History of The Great Fatherland War (Istoriya Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny) and Alexander Nekrich's 22nd June 1941 (22ogo Iyunya 1941). The official history, a useful source at the time, has now been largely superseded by less restricted research. Innocuous by Western standards, Nekrich's book makes the point that there was ample evidence to indicate hostile intent on Hitler's part and that it was ignored. The book provoked a storm and was withdrawn from circulation. 14 But the debate has lost none of its intensity. In the age of glasnost it is as acrimonious as ever.

III

The decade which followed Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin in 1956 is to date the most significant in the development of Soviet war literature. A host of young writers, many of whom had served at the front, appeared in print for the first time. To this period belong some of the best works written on The Great Fatherland War: Grigory Baklanov's South of the Main Blow; (Yuzhnee glavnogo udara; 1958); The Dead Feel no Shame (Mertvye sramu ne imut; 1961); July 1941 (Iyul' 41-ogo goda; 1965); Bulat Okudzhava's Good Luck, Schoolboy (Bud' zdorov, shkolyar; 1961); Yuri Bondarev's The Battalions Request Fire Support (Batal'ony prosyat ognya; 1957); The Final Salvoes (Poslednie zalpy; 1959); Quiet (Tishina; 1964) and Vasil' Bykov's The Third Flare (Tret'ya raketa; 1961) and His Battalion (Ego batal'on; 1959). These younger writers eschewed the great historic truth; that the war, and

especially its outcome, represented the triumph and confirmation of Marxist-Leninist principles. Banal generalisations about Party infallibility, common between 1941 and 1953, were now dropped. Psychological complexity and a more sober, grimmer depiction of the war experience became the hallmarks of this new appraisal. Themes such as cowardice, desertion, incompetence and even existential despair, hitherto ignored, now merited closer attention. Such phrases as okopnaya pravda ('the truth of the trenches'), literatura rascheta (literally, 'literature of account', i.e. coming to terms) and degeroizatsiya ('the demythification of the hero') have all been used by Soviet critics,¹⁵ during and after this period, to characterize this new approach to the war theme.

The Party and the Army, both of which have a deeply vested interest in the artistic treatment of the war theme, were not slow to perceive the contradictions and dangers which this change in emphasis posed for the orthodox interpretation of The Great Fatherland War. Writers who in the opinion of the Party went too far were accused of Remarquism, a term which had first appeared in the thirties. Now, after the war, it implied ideological deviation, falsification and even slanderous misrepresentation of the great sacrifice made by the people. Since the early sixties, along with okopnaya pravda, Remarquism has become an important term in the critical lexicon of Soviet war literature. It needs to be considered therefore at some length. However, Remarquism is important for two further reasons. First, historically and philosophically it embraces themes which Grossman touches upon in Stepan Kol'chugin - a pre-war work - and to which he returns in Za pravoe delo. Second, in the sixties and seventies Remarquism represented the ne plus ultra of the permissible. In Zhizn' i sud'ba Grossman clearly violates these limits, forcing us to ponder the criteria we should use to judge his magnum opus. To quote Vasil' Bykov, a writer often accused of Remarquism:

Значение этого романа, на мой взгляд, выходит далеко
за рамки понимания военной темы. В известном смысле

« Жизнь и судьба » - открытие для нашей литературы.¹⁶

Thus, an examination of Remarquism helps to put Grossman's achievement in some form of quantifiable perspective in relation to other major works in Soviet war literature.

Soviet interest in Remarque originates with the publication of All Quiet on the Western Front (Im Westen nichts Neues; 1929). Remarque's novel was quickly translated into Russian, two separate editions appearing in 1929.¹⁷ Since that time he has been the subject of considerable scrutiny in the Soviet Union. Unlike, however, the widespread approval which greeted the novel in the West, Soviet appraisal proved to be far more restrained, and at times overtly hostile. One possible reason for this is suggested by the year of publication. 1929 was the first full year of the inaugural Five-Year Plan. A novel which criticised military and social coercion - the very essence of the Plan and Collectivisation - would not have been too warmly received. Moreover, Remarque's implied espousal of Wilfred Owen's bitter poem, 'Dulce et decorum est', ran counter to the spirit of officially encouraged patriotism by means of which the Party hoped to mobilise the support of the population for its gigantic enterprises of social engineering.

Soviet criticism manifests a noticeable ambivalence towards Remarque. His later novels - The Return (Der Weg zurück; 1931), Arc de Triomphe (1946), Time to Live and Time to Die (Zeit zu leben und zeit zu sterben; 1954) - are readily construed as portrayals of capitalist society in decline. Yet the nature of personal experience in Im Westen nichts Neues cannot be so easily dismissed, or indeed confined to the western participants of World War One. Invariably, Soviet scholars adopt this approach. This is an obvious and fundamental flaw in their evaluation of Im Westen nichts Neues in relation to Soviet war literature.

Some doubt seems to exist as to when the term Remarquism was first used. One German study puts the date at 1961;¹⁸ specifically, in response to Grigoriy Baklanov's povest', A Patch of Earth (Pyad' zemli; 1959). This seems rather late, and it is more likely that the beginning of the thirties, as claimed by a Soviet critic of Remarque ¹⁹, is more accurate, mainly, as stated above, because of the novel's hostile socio-political implications at a time of great upheaval.

During the sixties the military played a leading role in instructing writers as to how the war should be dealt with in literature. At a specially convened meeting of the Union of Writers in 1964 General Epishev, head of the Army's political directorate,

condemned the lack of a sufficiently broad and epic interpretation of the war. He attacked too what he called the:

. . . вредные мотивы пацифизма, абстрактного осуждения войны просто как противоестественного явления, без проникновения в социальную, классовую сущность происходивших событий. 20

At the same meeting Marshal Malinovskiy, the Soviet Minister of Defence, made the military's position quite clear. He rejected the view of those who saw war as, . . . 'скопление только ужасов, лишений, в натуралистических подробностях'. 21 Continuing, he said:

Мы не имеем права механически переносить ремарковские идеи в наше творчество и лишать его подлинной героики, свойственной нашей жизни. 22

Clearly, from the standpoint of the military, Remarquism was too closely associated with pacifism, did not take into account class factors in war and was something alien. Ultimately, it could be claimed, Remarquism was the consequence of the unjust nature of World War One. By contrast, Soviet ideology is unequivocal as to the just nature of the conflict waged by the Soviet people against Nazi Germany. 23 Therefore, comparisons between the experience of 1914-18 and 1941-45 are odious and ideologically unsound. Nevertheless, as we have seen earlier in Stalin's wartime speeches, not all of history's great battles and names were so bluntly disregarded. Similarly, many Soviet critics discussing the war theme acknowledge the influence and tradition of L. N. Tolstoy. Here, one detects an inconsistency. Those considerations which negate any comparison of the Remarquist experience with that of 1941-45 must also apply with equal force to Tolstoy, since one of the main Soviet criteria employed to determine whether a war is just or unjust, is the extent to which it advances the cause of International Socialism. The war between Napoleon's France and Tsarist Russia could not be assessed in such terms. 24

An additional claim for the uniqueness of The Great Fatherland War resides in the Marxist-Leninist understanding of history. The authoritative Istoriya Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny is emphatic: this was a just war, and moreover, one whose victory over Fascist Germany was historically determined:

Уроки второй мировой войны весьма поучительны, они

характеризуют неумолимость законов истории. 25

According to Soviet Marxists the catalyst for World War One was a combination of nationalism and intense economic rivalry. This is consistent with the belief that: 'War is a method of resolving antagonistic conflicts based on private ownership relations'. 26

There can be little doubt that the aggressive patriotism which characterized much of European foreign policy before 1914 played an important role in the outbreak of World War One. Yet, in attempting to account for World War One on this basis, the Marxist critique must concede that patriotism or, to be more precise, in the Marxist lexicon, chauvinism, was a far more potent mixture for Europe's working classes than the prolix abstractions of internationalism. Whatever else it may have been, World War One was manifestly the failure of international socialist solidarity. During four years of mutual attrition, worker needed little encouragement to butcher his fellow worker.

Chauvinism alone is insufficient to explain the rapturous welcome given to the start of hostilities in the belligerent nations. Violence and the thrill of war were major themes in the work of many late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century European writers. Friedrich Nietzsche, Heinrich von Treitschke, Max Scheler, Georges Sorel, Filippo Marinetti, Rudyard Kipling and A. E. Housman all helped in varying degrees to make European public opinion receptive to the ostensible attractions of war. In Germany with the introduction of the Ausschuss für die Förderung der Wehrkraft durch Erziehung (Committee for the Promotion of Defence through Education 27) in 1899, militarism became enshrined in the pedagogical requirements of the country. A whole generation of German schoolchildren was brought up to accept the Nietzschean aphorism 'Krieg aller Dinge Vater'. Indeed, one cannot but notice some striking parallels between the militarization of Wilhelmine Germany, 1890-1918, and that of Soviet society from 1930 onwards. Both states felt themselves to be surrounded by hostile alliances, both encouraged military-patriotic education and both were highly autocratic. With regard to Hitler's Germany the parallels are of course still more striking. Thus, the discussion of Remarquism, if taken further, may question more than the perception that The Great Fatherland War is

unique; it underlines affinities which contest the very uniqueness and rectitude of the Soviet Union itself.

Inculcation of a strident military ethos with its concentration on the formal expression of violence and chauvinism was not the sole reason which led Germany's youth to join in the self-immolation of Europe in 1914. War seemed to offer the opportunity for self-realization, increasingly unattainable in the secure life styles of industrialized Europe. As one student of the period puts it:

Es brach in der Öde des technisch bequemen und
zivilisatorisch entzauberten Daseins ein elementarer
Hunger nach Wirklichkeit los, nach dem unverfälschten
Gefühl, dem Ende der Maskeraden, nach der Aufhebung der
individuellen Grenzen, nach dem Rausch der Verschmelzung. 28

Thus the Soviet observer is confronted with the disconcerting conclusion that Europe's working classes were not only not manipulated into war with one another, but that they, or at least a substantial element of them, were fascinated by the likelihood of war and what it seemed to offer. This lust for war - the Zeitgeist of 1914 - reaches its most concentrated form in the experience and personal philosophy of Ernst Jünger, a contemporary of Remarque. Jünger rejects the Marxist-Leninist conviction that war will cease when private ownership is universally abolished:

Der Krieg ist ebensowenig eine menschliche Einrichtung
wie der Geschlechtstrieb; er ist ein Naturgesetz, deshalb
werden wir uns niemals seinem Baume entwinden. Wir
dürfen ihn nicht leugnen, sonst wird er uns verschlingen. 29

Such an approach to the origins of World War One poses a further dilemma for Marxist ideology: if technological progress and greater material security lead to a desire for war, then the pursuit of such goals increases the probability of war. Remarque himself was well aware that technological advances had not conquered man's capacity for gratuitous violence. 30

The spirit of adventure with which German youth entered the war soon perished. Disparity between the expectations and the reality of war made this inevitable. With the war lust spent, it was perhaps natural that those facing extinction should clamour for a cessation of hostilities at almost any price. Patriotism had long since lost any

appeal for the front-line soldier. By then it was too late. Total war generates its own momentum; it is oblivious to the slaughter of millions; it is limited only by the availability of resources - human or material - and the efficiency of any given system to supply them. When the system collapses through internal or external pressures, an end to the bloodletting becomes feasible. The 'truth of the trenches' laid this fact bare; more than anything else, this was the grim reality of the Kriegserlebnis, in which Remarque participated. Here is where we must look, if we are to comprehend the despair which subsequently engulfed Remarque's generation, both during and after the war. Im Westen nichts Neues condemns war from the perspective of frustrated expectations as much as from any belief that war is intrinsically evil.

Unlike the officially encouraged displays of unity between soldier and state in Soviet war literature, Remarque's soldier-hero has distinctly ambivalent feelings towards his country and civilian counterparts. This is evident when he is home on leave from the front:

Ein fürchterliches Gefühl der Fremde steigt plötzlich in
mir hoch. Ich kann nicht zurückfinden, ich bin
ausgeschlossen. 31

Numerous scenes in Im Westen nichts Neues are set in hospitals. Descriptions of amputees, blood-poisoning and a range of gunshot wounds are designed to undermine any glamour associated with war. The whole relevance of occidental civilization - that which spawned Marx and Engels as well as Bismarck and the Kaiser - is called into question:

Es muß alles gelogen und belanglos sein, wenn die Kultur
von Jahrtausenden nicht einmal verhindern konnte, daß diese
Ströme von Blut vergossen wurden, daß diese Kerker der
Qualen zu Hunderttausenden existieren. 32

If one's own country is partially to blame for the carnage, there can be no complete identification of state and individual. Similarly, the hero's attitude towards his enemies is in marked contrast to the Soviet portrayal of the German soldier in World War Two. Remarque's examination is more complex. Attitudes vary from extreme hatred to even, paradoxically, a feeling of solidarity with the enemy. In

contrast to his successors in World War Two, who delight in torturing Russian prisoners of war, Remarque's hero is drawn towards the Russians whom he guards. Sympathy for the plight of these Russian soldiers leads him to redefine his relationship with his own superiors and former teachers:

Jeder Unteroffizier ist dem Rekruten, jeder Oberlehrer dem
Schüler ein schlimmerer Feind als sie uns. 33

At this point the Soviet critic might argue that his central thesis regarding World War One is still valid: workers on both sides of the wire are united in the class struggle. Of course the origins of the conflict would still have to be accounted for. Such a view is, however, undermined by Paul's admission (Remarque's hero) of the strange bond which exists between himself and the Russians:

Und dennoch würden wir wieder auf sie schießen und sie
auf uns, wenn sie frei wären. 34

Remarque's characters are motivated essentially by instinct:

Es ist der Instinkt des Tieres, der in uns erwacht,
der uns leitet und beschützt. 35

This is unavoidable in the fragmented and incoherent experience of war. Reason and understanding are superfluous items of baggage in the primeval and unremitting struggle for survival. Unable to rationalize the events taking place, Remarque's hero commits moral and intellectual suicide: 'Krieg ist Krieg schließlich'. 36 War is moral and physical calamity; this is the cardinal feature of the Remarquist experience. For the individual the claims of the just war are too abstract, and ultimately irrelevant. It is difficult to accept the all too often formulated response to Remarque of some Soviet critics, who assert that Remarque, . . . 'не обладает тем знанием законов общественного развития, каким обладаем мы. 37

The Soviet assessment of Im Westen nichts Neues is profoundly influenced by its own attitude towards pacifism. In a state which has had to fight for survival in desperate circumstances, pacifism is regarded with deep suspicion and seen as an unwarranted luxury in a hostile world. If by pacifism one means the renunciation of all violence, then Im Westen nichts Neues is not a pacifist text. Remarque's hero may experience momentary regret after he has killed a French soldier, but feelings of guilt and despair are soon overcome.

Survival demands the death of the foe. The core of pacifism consists in a denial of the instinctive urge to kill, based on an intellectual and moral rejection of violence. Remarque's soldiers have no such qualms. They dare not, for to deny their instincts in such situations would be to disarm a powerful, natural defence mechanism. Remarque has been attacked 38, because Paul, having killed a French soldier, does not fulfil his promise to the dying man to fight those who turned them against one another. This misses the point. Paul's anguish stems not from any sense of nascent, political consciousness - which is allegedly betrayed - but from the fact that he watches the French soldier slowly die, a victim of his frenzied handiwork with a bayonet. The disgust is not moral - although there are brief pangs of guilt - but physical. It is hardly surprising that when the source of this physical discomfort is no longer present, he forgets his hastily given promise.

Far more importance may be attached to Soviet claims that Remarque's characters inspire passivity.³⁹ In addition Lev Kopelev has drawn attention to the alcoholic escapism and pessimism which are frequently to be found in much of Remarque's fiction. With some justification he maintains that there are no fighters in Remarque, only sufferers.⁴⁰ These objections help to explain why, from an ideological standpoint, Henri Barbusse's novel about World War One, Fire (Le Feu; 1916), is more palatable to Soviet orthodoxy than Im Westen nichts Neues. Remarque's pessimism does not express itself in a desire for revolutionary social change. Barbusse's characters are politically astute:

герои Барбюса возмущаются, негодуют или приходят в отчаяние протестуют, стараются додуматься до причин, породивших кровопролитие. Они прозревают на страницах книги, облик их меняется, они духовно растут, говоря горьковской формулой, « в сопротивлении среде ». 41

In the light of the preceding examination of Remarquism in its social, military and historical context, we may summarize its salient features as follows: it is anti-authoritarian; war is essentially a chaotic phenomenon which does not lend itself to rational analysis; war brutalizes; the relationship between combatants is more complex than is customarily suggested by official propaganda; war induces

passivity and nihilism; the concept of the just war is a fallacy.

Clearly these points have profound implications for any attempt to impose a narrow Marxist-Leninist interpretation on war. Remarque's novel, and those Soviet writers who deliberately or unavoidably come close to his portrayal of war, represent a serious challenge to many officially sponsored notions of the Soviet-German war 1941-45. The dilemma facing Soviet orthodoxy is apparent. The unique status arrogated to The Great Fatherland War is called into question if one accepts that the Remarquist experience, primarily that of the individual, is common to all wars. The greater the convergence of experience, the less tenable are the claims of uniqueness. A final, point needs to be stressed. One might assume that Soviet critics have proceeded from a careful study of Im Westen nichts Neues and are, therefore, well aware of the problems which it poses for the analysis and exposition of Soviet war literature. Yet there exist distinct advantages for certain elements of the Soviet literary establishment to promote the idea that Remarquism equals pacifism. It provides a protective screen behind which the real issues of war remain hidden from all but the most daring and artistically adroit of writers. The less courageous or skilful, unwilling to incur 'the dreaded accusation of Remarquism'⁴², are more likely to avoid potentially controversial themes.

No single Soviet writer's work exemplifies in toto the definition of Remarquism offered above. To elucidate more fully the relationship between the theoretical background to Remarquism and the depiction of Remarquist themes necessitates the analysis of the work of more than one writer. A selection of writers will be briefly considered.

Chronologically not part of the new wave of war literature which appeared after 1956, Viktor Nekrasov's V okopakh Stalingrada is nevertheless a seminal work with regard to developments in Soviet war prose. Nekrasov legitimately saw himself as the main Soviet Remarquist.⁴³ The povest' was initially serialized in the journal Znamya under the title Stalingrad. According to Nekrasov, some critics found the title Stalingrad blasphemous ⁴⁴, and a separate edition was given the present title. This not without some irony, since the new title embodies, far more than the original, the ethos of okopnaya pravda, rather than the grandiose portrayal of war implicit

in 'Stalingrad'.

The change of title is more relevant for the work as whole. Attention is focused on small groups of men, no attempt is made to glorify war and a number of scenes permit Nekrasov to make some telling criticisms of the Soviet High Command's prosecution of the war. Concern for the microcosm of war does not necessarily imply rejection of the main thrust of military operations, or indeed their relevance for the individual. Hence Nekrasov's description of the unmitigated disaster in the summer of 1942. Evidence of any coherent Soviet strategy is difficult to find. That the Red Army eventually finds itself in Stalingrad owes more to the vagaries of fate than to any carefully conceived plan of strategic withdrawal. The rout of the Red Army is total. An atmosphere of doom and chaos pervades this retreat. Painstakingly prepared defensive positions are hastily abandoned as the German armoured columns push deeper into the hinterland. Soviet Officers, largely ignorant of the overall operational situation, lose control of their men, many of whom are not even armed. Nekrasov offers no great historic truth, only the aphorism of bitter personal experience: 'На войне никогда ничего не знаешь, кроме того, что у тебя под самым носом творится.'⁴⁵ There is a marked dearth of martial ardour. The order to retreat brings welcome relief: 'и без боя... Главное, что без боя'.⁴⁶ It is perhaps fitting that Marshal Malinovskiy, so concerned that writers emphasise the less depressing aspects of war, should be remembered in a recent collection of povesti in circumstances very similar to those described by Nekrasov.⁴⁷ The Remarquist writers were an unwelcome reminder of just how bad things were in 1942.

Nekrasov's narrative is remarkably restrained and numerous opportunities to preach are resisted. Desertion is one such area. The question of individual desertion, although not condoned, and in the case of one officer, Kaluzhsky, roundly condemned, somehow seems secondary to the mass desertion of the Red Army. Retreating through a village at night, Kerzhentsev feels that the Red Army has failed the people: 'и мы идем молча, точно сознавая вину свою, смотря себе под ноги'.⁴⁸ Feelings of guilt and obligation are intensified when an old lady blesses a soldier. This is a profoundly moving scene: only a miracle from God, and not Stalin, can now save Mother Russia.

Flashback is an important narrative technique throughout Nekrasov's povest'. Kerzhentsev, waiting for a mining party to complete its work, recalls peace-time Kiev. Memories of peace heighten the experience of war. Moreover they enable Nekrasov to refer obliquely to Soviet military disasters. For example the receipt of a card from Kerzhentsev's mother is linked to the fall of Kiev in 1941. Much of this flashback goes beyond a pleasant foray into the past; it is an attempt to escape the present. One senses a finality, an irrevocable loss, in the transition from peace to war. Indeed, on one occasion the mother of a girl whom Kerzhentsev has met in Stalingrad before the start of the German offensive, refers to Kerzhentsev's generation as the 'несчастное поколение'.⁴⁹ This invites comparison with the term 'потерянное поколение'⁵⁰ often used by Soviet critics with reference to Remarque and his contemporaries. The comparison is further strengthened by the same sense of alienation, which we have already seen in Remarque. The gulf of experience between combatant and non-combatant is difficult to bridge.

Reversal of expectations emerges as a most effective device in Nekrasov's povest'. The ferocity and almost hypnotic power with which the Germans attempt to obliterate Stalingrad remind Kerzhentsev of a childhood painting of World War One. The painting, hitherto impressive in its stark depiction, now seems utterly trivial in comparison with the burning city around him. He observes: 'и мне вдруг становится совершенно ясно, как бессильно, беспомощно искусство.'⁵¹ It is tempting to see criticism of socialist realism in this remark. Rejection of art as an adequate substitute for what one might loosely term 'experienced reality' is, in the Soviet context, a political statement. Nekrasov repudiates the wildly intemperate and anodyne claims of conformist literature. It is this conflict of personal experience and official interpretation which lies at the heart of the whole debate on okopnaya pravda and Remarquism.

V okopakh Stalingrada is a sober assessment of war which pays tribute to the moral and physical resources of the Russian soldier. There are some obvious affinities with Remarque. The longed-for peace will be as difficult to adapt to as the war had been, and much of what before the war had been so important now seems trivial. Accusations of pacifism are unwarranted. The war against Hitler had to be won, but

Nekrasov refuses to add lustre to its dangers and privations, all the more so when so many Russian soldiers died as a result of incompetent leadership. Sentiments of this kind attract the Remarquist label as much as any depiction of the daily grind in the trenches.

Central to Bulat Okudzhava's examination of war in his povest' Bud' zdorov, shkolyar is the destruction of the heroic myth associated with The Great Fatherland War. The epigraph alludes to Remarque's in Im Westen nichts Neues and sets the scene for what follows:

Это не приключения. Это о том, как я воевал. Как меня убить хотели, но мне повезло. 52

The ideological and pedagogical assumptions underpinning the Soviet ethos of the heroic envisage a hero who controls events around him. His heroic deed, or podvig, is assessed according to the criterion of social utility 53, and its source of inspiration is political consciousness, which stems from the Party. However, Okudzhava's schoolboy wilfully embraces the world of sexual fantasy and sleep, seeking to avoid the responsibilities imposed on him by military service. Similarly, sentiments such as, . . . 'В детстве я плакал много' 54 and , . . . 'Спасите меня. я не хочу умереть' 55, are designed to shatter the aggressive image of heroism. From a doctrinal standpoint the schoolboy's 'пресловутая инфантильность' 56 is indeed pernicious. Charges of infantilism are not lightly dismissed. The combination of military uniform - the archetypal symbol of masculinity - with adolescent sexuality and a superficial naivety, is intended to undermine the sexless, ascetic ideal so often seen in Soviet heroes.

The role of chance, too, vitiates the belief that everything is under control. Death occurs not by fiat, but by error: a girl killed by her own side; Kuzin, the telephonist, killed by a spent bullet; and the schoolboy, although wounded, has not even seen the enemy, let alone fired his weapon. The irony of the epigraph is recalled as the schoolboy ponders what kind of soldier he is. War is an event in which man is manipulated, his power of decision and his initiative have been removed: 'Идет война. Идет она себе без передышки. Делает свои дела. Ни на кого не смотрит ... 57 In a world where the boundary between the living and the dead is determined not by one's own actions, but by the blind workings of chance, a conscious act of heroism becomes almost impossible.

In his address to the Union of Writers in 1964, Marshal Malinovsky defined the nature of the podvig which he expected Soviet writers to depict in their work. The podvig, was he said:

, . . . 'концентрированное выражение тех высоких качеств,
которые заложены и воспитаны в нем[the hero]
социалистическим строем, партией коммунистов. 58

The process of degeroizatsiya is hostile to this definition, but in addition implies some pointed criticism. If the schoolboy is incapable of an ideologically motivated act of heroism, yet is a product of the socialist system and its values, then either the schoolboy is an ideological deviant, or the assumptions of Soviet ideologues as to what constitutes the heroic are erroneous. Frightened, alone and psychologically disorientated the schoolboy certainly is, but is he a coward, or even a deviant? He does after all volunteer for war service, whereas a school colleague, Fedka, manages to avoid war duty. Selfishness is common at the front, too. Shongin, an old soldier, has nevertheless proved exceptionally adept at shirking all the customary dangers of active service and steadfastly refuses to share the spoils of his foraging with his comrades. The unstated question is: can a man who refuses to share his food be relied on in battle? Probably not; in any case we never find out: Shongin is blown to pieces by a shell. His behaviour, however, confirms the view that the only kind of heroic deed in such a world is personal survival. The rest is irrelevant.

Bud' zdorov, shkolyar is a deeply pessimistic account of war. The schoolboy's 'adventures' in no way sustain the position, commonly propagated in both Western and Soviet war literature, that war provides an opportunity for man to ennoble himself. In Okudzhava's story heroism is a sham; comradeship, which even Remarque venerates as the great palliative of the front, is an illusion; official patriotism a grotesque lie.

Grigory Baklanov's work is closely associated with okopnaya pravda and like Nekrasov and Okudzhava, he concentrates on the harshness and brutal contradictions which are to be found in war. Moreover, through his portrayal of small groups of men and women at war he is able to raise questions of a profound and universal significance.

Whereas in Okudzhava's povest' the schoolboy and his fellows are

aware of the limitations imposed on them by the chaos and randomness of war, Baklanov's characters are permitted to persist in the illusion that they enjoy some measure of comprehension. Thus, the inevitable disruption of this illusion is intensified, inducing near psychological collapse. This is forcibly underlined by the death of Babin in Pyad' zemli. He dies, killed by a random shell, having just successfully led a desperate break-out from German encirclement. To die in this manner, after what has passed, is absurd. Frustration, bitterness and anger crush any sense of elation felt by his two closest comrades, Motovilov and Rita. The successful break-out now seems meaningless, and fate appears unjust and capricious.

As with Nekrasov, the disintegration of expectations - both the protagonists' and the readers' - is an essential element in Baklanov's narrative method. In Mertvye sramu ne imut the scout Mostovoy recalls an incident at the start of the war. A German soldier released him when he could quite easily have killed him. Thus the cliché that all Germans are bad is not endorsed. This experience has an unsettling effect on Mostovoy himself. The German, in releasing him, not only gave him life, but placed a moral obligation on him for the future: if all Germans are not bad, then it behoves Mostovoy to discriminate between good and bad. In the heat of battle such distinctions are impossible. Mostovoy is only too aware of this acute dilemma: 'Были б одинаковые, дело б легче решалось'.⁵⁹ This incident surfaces in a slightly different form later in the same work. Vasich, the political officer, who felt uneasy listening to Mostovoy's story, has his own preconceptions badly shaken. Looking into the cab of a German lorry which they have just ambushed, he sees the dead driver, who bears no resemblance to the stereotypes he had imagined.

The concern for moral values emerges as a key theme in Baklanov's fiction. Notwithstanding the apparent advantages which accrue to the unscrupulous, Baklanov advocates absolute codes of conduct. On closer examination this stance is shown to have very little in common with the materialism of Marxism-Leninism. In Pyad' zemli such questions are brought sharply into focus as the tactical situation of the Russian soldiers on the beachhead deteriorates. A heavy German tank attack is imminent, and Mezentsev, a soldier in Motovilov's company, argues that they should abandon their untenable position.

His arguments are beguilingly cogent. It is, he says, futile to die defending something hopeless, and with the end of the war in sight, why waste life? Mezentsev attempts to justify this course of action by appeals to reason: 'человек должен управляться разумом, а не ложными чувствами'.⁶⁰ This suggestion enrages Motovilov. To abandon their position, even with final victory so near, would be a betrayal of those who had already fallen in similar situations. Mezentsev's appeal to reason is a convenient device for camouflaging his cowardice. Nevertheless, the issue raised - the extent to which reason is valid in determining moral conduct - is of special importance for the two works under discussion, and for Baklanov's whole attitude to war.

The rationale of abandonment is based on moral relativism. For Motovilov moral values are absolute, self-evident, almost tautological: evil is evil, why is it necessary to prove that black is black?⁶¹ The character of Mezentsev has been dismissed as alien to Soviet society.⁶² This is an understandable, if somewhat partisan appraisal. Mezentsev's arrogance and his determined and devious pursuit of his own ends are too cogent to be simply brushed aside. Indeed, the frequency with which the Mezentsev type occurs in Soviet war literature suggests that he is anything but alien to Soviet society, nor of course is he unique to it. Mezentsev is recognisable as a paradigm of selfish behaviour often encountered in extreme and dangerous situations. He is supremely indifferent to the fate of his fellows and to what Baklanov considers to be one of the fundamental laws of the front:

За тех, кто жалеет себя в бою, другие расплачиваются
кровью. Это закон войны.⁶³

Mezentsev's cunning succeeds. He is summoned to the rear before the Germans attack and survives. His conduct challenges the almost universally held, and emotionally satisfying belief in justice. In time of crisis, treachery and naked selfishness do pay off.

Mezentsev symbolizes temptation too. Motovilov, having heard his arguments, tells him to crawl around on his belly - an apposite reply, since Mezentsev is indeed a wise serpent. In this respect he is redolent of Smerdyakov in Dostoevskiy's Brat'ya Karamazovy. A comparison with Dostoevskiy is not entirely fortuitous, given

Baklanov's interest in human behaviour under pressure; neither is its relevance confined to the trenches. A German deserter is questioned as to his country's motives, and how they can be justified. He answers: 'Справедливо то, что полезно нации.'⁶⁴ Here we see the selfishness and moral relativism of Mezentssev embodied in the state. It offers, at least in part, an explanation for the baffling ease with which the Germans were able to carry out atrocities on the eastern front. They have crossed (непеступили ⁶⁵) a moral threshold. The dichotomous moral code which permits the soldier to kill and in turn be killed (described by Baklanov as: 'Это извечно старо, всегда это перед солдатом'⁶⁶), but proscribes the slaughter of the unarmed, more or less broke down. This readily supplies the logical basis for 'all is permitted', and hence the stupefying cruelty of the German occupation.

The moral question in Baklanov is superficially complicated by the fact that some of the least attractive characters are Russians. In addition they survive, whereas others, more worthy of life, perish. In Mertvye sramu ne imut this violation of the accepted fictional outcome stands out. The title alludes to those who are morally, but not physically dead. Ishchenko, an officer, is guilty of cowardice, and his military superiors can prove nothing, since the sole witness is dead. Ishchenko himself manifests only fleeting feelings of remorse which are soon displaced by self-congratulation at his escape, and hostility to the fallen and to those who would punish him, should they prove his cowardice. A definite function is fulfilled by the presence of these unsavoury characters in the Russian camp. If all evil were confined to the enemy, this might well invite the simplistic interpretation that all good was to be found only on the Russian side. Inevitably, the distinction between friend and foe is obfuscated. The implications, however, are clear: categories of good and evil cannot be reduced to ideology alone.

Baklanov is the most problematic of the three writers examined. Psychological complexity, and above all the concern for absolute values of good and evil, necessarily render the Remarquist label less than adequate. Baklanov goes where Remarque fears to tread, or indeed cannot tread. At times barely hidden, these are themes which in Baklanov are potentially far more provocative than military

incompetence or the failure to glorify the Party's role in allegedly winning the war.

The Remarquist debate arose largely as a result of official insecurity and alarm over the new direction being taken in Soviet war literature after 1956. During the Brezhnev years the slur of Remarquism remained a powerful disincentive for many writers. Nevertheless, some were prepared to explore and probe the boundaries of the permissible. Vasil' Bykov was one, and many of his accounts of partisan warfare, such as Sotnikov, Obelisk and Volch'ya staya belong to this period.

Yet mediocre writers were being rewarded. Ivan Stadnyuk, a former political commissar, won the 1983 State Prize for Literature, an event which indicated that the neo-Stalinist interpretation of the war was the officially favoured one. His award-winning novel War (Voyna; 1974-1980) seeks to rehabilitate the wisdom and guiding role of Stalin, while patently ignoring the disastrous early years of the war, the confusion and the general lack of readiness.

Similarly, on the dawn of Gorbachev's accession the primacy of Marxism-Leninism in the interpretation of the war was reaffirmed. In the preface to a questionnaire, commissioned by the editorial board of the journal Voprosy literatury, to mark the fortieth anniversary of the victory over Germany, Lt General Repin, a senior army officer commented:

В борьбе против этой идеологии история отвела особое место марксистско-ленинской идеологии. Научно обоснованной, подтвержденной практикой, прочно овладевшей умами миллионов людей, ей предстояло одержать победу в этой борьбе.⁶⁷

If one bears in the mind the writers who participated in this questionnaire, inter alia Grigory Baklanov, Vasil' Bykov, Anatoly Genatulin, Vyacheslav Kondrat'ev, Daniil Granin and Ales' Adamovich, one can see just how immense the gulf between official perceptions of the war and those of the more talented writers really is. Far from endorsing the principles of Marxism-Leninism these writers are attempting to cast off its shackles. They seek the truth about the war; they want its relevance for contemporary Soviet society acknowledged.⁶⁸ Baklanov's views leave us in no doubt: 'Для меня это не прибежище от жизни, а жизнь.'⁶⁹

III

It is, of course, too early to assess the full impact of Gorbachev's reforms in the arts. Yet striking changes in the presentation of the war theme are evident. Literature, the arts in general, and academic disciplines such as history are at the forefront of this reevaluation.

A serious effort to address these issues in an unbiased way took place in 1988 at a conference, organised under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences, the Union of Writers and the Academy of Social Sciences. Indicative of the fundamental relationship between history and belletrism in the Soviet Union was the conference's title: 'Topical Questions of Historical Science and Literature' ('Aktual'nye voprosy istoricheskoy nauki i literatury').⁷⁰

By far the most cutting remarks on the conventional portrayal of the war were made by Viktor Astaf'ev. He lambasted the official histories of the war, arguing that as bad as Stalin was, he was simply being used as the latest scapegoat on which to heap all the nation's woes.⁷¹ He disputes the actual figure for Soviet losses in men. The Soviet Union, he says, still does not know the exact figure of its war dead.⁷² Great literature over this period has been achieved in spite of, not because of Soviet historians. Astaf'ev's harshest criticisms are reserved for Soviet military expertise, a highly sensitive area at the best of times. His views are worth quoting in full:

Мы просто не умели воевать. Мы и закончили войну, не умея воевать. Мы залили своей кровью, завалили врагов своими трупами. Вы посмотрите на любую из карт 1941 и даже 1944 года: там обязательно 9 красных стрелок против 2-3 синих. Это 9 наших армий воюют против 2-3 противника. И так все время, на протяжении всей войны. Одной армией Манштейн разгромил на глазах черноморского флота все наши армии в Крыму, прошел Сиваш оставив потом часть войск у осажденного Севастополя, с двумя танковыми корпусами сбегал под Керчь и опрокинул в море три наши армии! Я понимаю об этом писать очень тяжело. Лучше, конечно, когда под барабанный бой провозглашается, что мы победили.⁷³

Given such incisive and remorseless criticism, the participation of

Ivan Stadnyuk in the conference represents an anomaly. He defended himself against the accusation that he had distorted the truth in his novels.⁷⁴ Yet his response sounded shallow, it lacked conviction and the whole tone of Stadnyuk's speech was defensive. Glasnost' means a rough time for those who were the willing apologists of Stalin in the Brezhnev years.

Astaf'ev is not a lone voice. In an article in Literaturnaya gazeta he received vigorous support from Viktor Shaposhnikov:

Правдивое слово о войне отвоевало на сегодняшний день
такие огромные территории, что не за горами уже день новой
победы - над ложью, над фальсификацией, над теми
историческими « легендами и мифами », которыми нам так
долго морочили голову...⁷⁵

Many other themes, first broached in the late fifties and sixties, have also received their fair share of attention. A major taboo in Soviet war literature, which, one suspects, for many still is, concerns those Soviet citizens, who through no fault of their own, spent long periods in German captivity. To date one of the most sensitive accounts is Tat'yana Vasileva's "Tears of Slavery" ("Slezy nevoli"; 1988).⁷⁶ 14 years old at the time of the German invasion, Vasil'eva is shipped to Germany where she spends the war working in various enterprises as an Ostarbeiter. Vasil'eva harbours no bitterness towards the Germans. She encounters many Nazi diehards, but in addition she meets many who are as frightened and lonely as she is. Without their help, which was a serious violation of Nazi regulations, survival would have been impossible.

Bitterness is very much part of Ilya Palkin's "Unknown Soldiers" ("Neizvestnye soldaty"; 1988).⁷⁷ The unknown soldiers of the title are those Russian soldiers who were unfortunate enough to have been captured by the Germans. Brutally treated in captivity, they were scorned, and in many cases arrested as traitors - if they survived - on their return to the Soviet Union. Palkin goes some way to removing this unjustified stigma of treachery and cowardice. Many bore the grim conditions of captivity with dignity and courage, and this, too, deserves its place in the annals of the Red Army.

Stereotypes are the theme in Anatoliy Genatulin's excellent povest', "Tunnel" ("Tunnel'"; 1987).⁷⁸ Kleshnin, Genatulin's embittered

hero, detests Germans. Hatred seems justified, since his sweetheart was raped and murdered by German soldiers in the last days of the war. Peacetime brings him no respite. Kleshnin works alongside German prisoners of war on a tunnel project and his hatred grows, blighting his life. But the wartime legacy is challenged. Only after working with the Germans does Kleshnin realise that 'Fritz', a popular wartime term of contempt for Germans, is also a name in its own right. Behind the name there is humanity too. Having been robbed and left for dead by Russians, Kleshnin is rescued from almost certain death on the edge of a ravine by German tunnel workers. The name Fritz acquires a new meaning. Recuperating in hospital, Kleshnin learns that the two parties digging the tunnel have joined up with one another. The battle to dig the tunnel has been won. At this juncture Kleshnin is presented with an opportunity to exact some form of personal revenge on the Germans. All the evidence suggests that the Germans carried out the attack on Kleshnin, or so the police believe. Kleshnin's testimony is vital, but he resists the temptation to implicate the Germans falsely, which would deny them the chance of repatriation which is imminent. Symbolically, therefore the threads of the story are finally tied together. Kleshnin has taken the first tentative and arduous steps to break out of the captivity of hatred. He has emerged from the tunnel.

Critics of glasnost in the Army and Party have not been slow to react to this spirit of iconoclasm. The literary and other specialist journals have become a battlefield of ideas, as supporters and opponents of reform, attempt to secure the ascendancy for their point of view.

At the forefront in this debate is the theoretical journal of the Soviet Ministry of Defence, Voenno-istoricheskiy zhurnal. This is not surprising, given the extent to which interest has once again focused on the early phase of the war, referred to somewhat euphemistically by Soviet historians as the 'initial period of the war' (начальный период войны). Just how wide the difference of opinion is regarding this period can be appreciated in the factors held by the military historians to be responsible for German military success: material superiority; greater experience in military operations; and the factor of surprise 79 (a list of factors rejected by Astaf'ev and many

others).

There is nothing original in this response; quite the reverse in fact. This is not far short of what Stalin claimed on July 3 1941 were the reasons for the Germans' success. Even the preliminary formula, 'фашистские войска вероломно вторглись на территорию СССР' mirrors Stalin.⁸⁰ Accusing Nazi Germany of breaking faith only serves to highlight the fact that the Soviet Union had concluded a treaty with the arch-enemy of humanity. One might reasonably accept the Soviet rationale that the pact was concluded by the Soviet government to buy time, an act of expediency. This of course means that the Soviet Union was aware of the threat posed by Hitler. Thus, it can hardly claim that it was taken by surprise, nor that the factor of surprise was so overwhelming.

The journal has been especially critical of the manner in which this phase of the war has been dealt with by writers:

В последнее время « усилиями » ряда писателей, журналистов и историков начальный период Великой Отечественной Войны вопреки исторической достоверности и архивным документам из тяжелого превращается в « трагический » и в основном ассоциируется со словами « неудача », « растерянность », « неразбериха ». ⁸¹

Army sensitivity to accusations of incompetence was understandable in 1988, since it marked the 70th anniversary of the Red Army's creation. In the light of Gorbachev's reforms, one might have thought that the Army would have sought to reassert the role of the Army in the defeat of Hitler. In the late 80s it is strange and incomprehensible to find these neo-Stalinist sympathies and interpretations of The Great Fatherland War; even more so when some of these reactionary articles appeared in the second edition of *Okt'yabr'* for 1988 alongside Grossman's *Zhizn' i sud'ba*. Comparing Gareev's assessment of the war with that of Grossman's, one wonders whether they are writing about the same war. Gareev ignores Stalin's incompetence, reaffirms the strength and purpose of Marxism-Leninism, and implicitly warns the supporters of *glasnost'* not to get carried away with the wholesale disparagement ('*ogul'noe okhaivanie*', a term commonly used by those hostile to *glasnost'*) of the past. He attacks those writers who cast doubt upon the legitimacy of The Great

Fatherland War, reserving his ire for those who wish to renounce concepts of just and unjust wars. Most importantly, he makes the military's position clear on the relationship between glasnost' and the reputation of the Armed Forces:

Гласность коснулась и военной среды, становятся известными факты, которые до этого не всегда были открытыми. Наряду с объективной и правильной критикой нередко они сопровождаются обывательским смакованием. Широкая гласность (в пределах соблюдения государственной и военной тайны) ничего, кроме пользы, не принесет, и не следует ее бояться. 82

A reasonable and fair response, one might think; but there is a sting in the tail:

Но как мы полагаем, критика недостатков, имеющихся в армии и на флоте, должна быть доброжелательной и способствовать укреплению их боеспособности. 83

This is hardly a concession to glasnost'. Such a flexible framework within which the Army would be prepared to accept criticism would make it very easy for unwelcome analyses - of an historical or contemporary nature - to be dismissed out of hand.

Involvement in Afganistan opens up a new chapter in Soviet war literature. Obvious differences separate The Great Fatherland War from the war in Afganistan, but the nature of personal experience in both wars has much in common. Given the new freedoms which the literary journals now enjoy, opportunities for new writers would appear to be favourable.

Truth was the watchword of the thaw, and a bitter complaint levelled by Soviet soldiers at their war correspondents was the manifest failure to tell the truth. Mikhail Kozhukov, the veteran war correspondent of Komsomol'skaya pravda has this to say:

"The question they [Soviet soldiers] ask me a thousand times is 'Why don't you write the truth?'

"They mean that we didn't describe their feelings and events correctly; that we tried to make things sound better than they were". 84

Numerous interviews with Soviet soldiers who have served in Afganistan have been published in the Soviet press and journals. Responses vary from wholehearted endorsement of official policy in the

Brezhnev era, and the brief Andropov and Chernenko interregnum, to some refreshing answers given wide circulation in Gorbachev's day. Particularly informative were the results of interviews published in Znamya,⁸⁵ whose editor is Grigory Baklanov. Soldiers spoke of their anger at the "unknown soldiers" who were dying unacknowledged in Afganistan. Here is an implicit admission that despite all the talk of "international duty", the war was far from being a just war, and was in fact a source of embarrassment.

Ideas of duty and Motherland now have to compete alongside the attractions of Western pop groups. Invariably the former have lost out. The popularity of western pop groups tells us that the majority of Soviet soldiers were very young;⁸⁶ hence perhaps the appeal of Bulat Okudzhava, whose poems and ballads capture the theme of lost youth. In any war youth pays a heavy price.

An interesting feature of Soviet soldiers who served in Afganistan resides in their adoption of the title afganets. One would not expect a Soviet soldier returning from occupation duty in Germany at the end of World War Two to refer to himself as a nemets. This is a useful clue to the nature of the war and real attitudes among Soviet soldiers. Far from accepting the propaganda about the enemy with its simplified labels of the forces of counter-revolution, Soviet soldiers came to admire the resolve, skill and the moral and physical fibre of the dushman or dukh, their term for their enemy. Calling himself an afganets was the highest compliment that the Soviet soldier could pay, consciously or sub-consciously, to his erstwhile foe. In terms of his equipment and training the dushman was a 'poor benighted heathen', but he was a first class fighting man.

It is still too early to determine what the dominant literary themes of this war will prove to be. However, some of the early trends are familiar; disenchantment with military life; a sense of isolation on returning home; and even, perhaps, the awareness that active service, for all its dangers, offers a sense of direction. Such themes have much in common with Remarque. It is probably not too imprudent to assert that future accounts of this war which merit consideration will be written in a similar spirit. Soldiers may serve under different banners, but all endure a common experience.

The War Years

Chapter III

I

No other Soviet writer can match the diversity of theme to be found in Grossman's wartime writing and only a few writers could rival his appeal to the Soviet readership between 1941-1945. This chapter seeks, firstly, to examine this diversity, and, secondly, to elucidate those areas and themes which are pertinent to developments in Grossman's post-war prose.

The war theme occupies an important part in the final chapters of Stepan Kol'chugin. Since this work has a direct bearing on Grossman's later portrayal of war a brief discussion will serve as a useful preface to the prose of The Great Fatherland War.

Two youthful heroes are the main medium through which Grossman parallels the growth of the revolutionary movement and Russia's involvement in World War One. Stepan Kol'chugin endures arrest and exile, while his close friend, Sergey Kravchenko, despite his revolutionary convictions, is swept along in the euphoria of war, and he volunteers.

Sergey's expectations of excitement are justified. At the front, moving closer to the battle zone, he and his comrades are conscious of unknown, yet strangely familiar feelings:

Новый закон, новое чувство легко, в первые же минуты,
обладало людьми, не вызвав в них даже удивления

...их двигала сила, она владела их волей, чувствами.¹

Enemy artillery fire interrupts and in a sense confirms these cogitations. Thoughts of self-preservation take over and the cries of the wounded are ignored in the rush for cover. Yet, the dangers of war contain their own reward; they mitigate the discomforts. Reconnoitring the Austrian lines, Sergey experiences a, . . . 'радостное и в то же время пугающее чувство свободы, самостоятельности'.² The mission is more than just the observation of the enemy positions, it becomes an exploration of the individual, of his courage and self-reliance. War appears positive.

Wounded, Sergey abruptly terminates his period of convalescence at home to return to the front. One might interpret this abandonment of home as the rejection of his father's liberalism and the secure world of the middle classes - in part it is. Yet it would appear to owe more to fatalistic impulses than to any renewed commitment to revolutionary politics. His destiny in the trenches will not lead to revolutionary glory, but to, . . . 'солдатский хлеб и солдатская смерть.'³

Given the fact that Grossman brings no personal experience of war to bear, his knowledge of detail and psychological percipience are impressive in Stepan Kol'chugin. K. Lavrova, a pre-war critic, has identified what she calls Grossman's 'локальная ограниченность'⁴, in his depiction of the war, a term which adumbrates the term, lokal'nyy printsip, used by critics in the post-war period to characterize the intensely personal approach found in okopnaya pravda. One suspects that Grossman may have gone too far in his portrayal of life in the trenches, as witnessed by Lavrova's somewhat emphatic assertion that Grossman:

. . . 'вступает в противоборство с традициями
стереотипного « военного » романа о народе-старостотерпце,
об угнетающей силе войны, об окопной дружбе, нейтрализующей
противоречия между людьми перед лицом смерти.'⁵

Lavrova inadvertently raises the question of sources for the war scenes. An obvious one would be Tikhii Don, but no Soviet critic would refer to Sholokhov's text as a 'stereotyped military novel'. Im Westen nichts Neues offers another potential source and much of the detail in Sergey's war experiences does indeed invite comparison with Remarque. Some aspects have already been touched upon. Like Paul and a great many of his generation, Sergey is a volunteer. Similarly, the heightened awareness and the reliance on instinct as the troops approach the frontline and Sergey's sudden termination of leave, reflect identical incidents in Remarque's work.

There are others too. Sabansky, a Russian officer, witnesses the arbitrary and brutal treatment meted out to some Hungarian prisoners of war. Disturbed by this ugly incident but unable to find any rational explanation, he resigns himself to the gratuitous violence of war: 'Война есть война'⁶, he concludes.

Hospital scenes, conspicuous by their absence in a large part of Soviet war literature, are not glossed over. Grossman highlights the iniquitous distinction which is made between victims of enemy action and those who are suffering from debilitating illnesses, common in the squalor of trench life. Over those suffering from typhus, pneumonia and dysentery hangs the unwarranted suspicion of malingering.

By far the most important parallel with Remarque, and one which refutes Lavrova's suggestion that Grossman has nothing in common with him, is the role of comradeship. This at least offers some recompense for the dangers. Without it the war would be an unendurable and meaningless penance:

Здесь, перед лицом смерти, в тяжелых невзгодах, открылась величественная сила дружба доверчивого общения человека с человеком. Дружба, возникшая на фронте, тверда, она прочней даже детских привязанностей. И как странно, что многие сердца впервые открываются для дружбы в часы войны. 7

Thus, the depiction of World War One in Stepan Kol'chugin has more in common with Remarque than Soviet critics are prepared to acknowledge. Wishing to set the scene, Grossman strives for historical accuracy. Remarque's portrayal has become universally established as the archetypal experience of World War One. Im Westen nichts Neues is, therefore, a natural source of reference for the lost generation to which Sergey belongs. However, in the scenes discussed, we can find evidence that the common ground between Grossman and Remarque is not solely a matter of historical background. Both authors stress the worth of comradeship. But there exist major differences, some already apparent in Stepan Kol'chugin, and many of which go well beyond what we have come to understand by Remarquism. Ignored by Western and Soviet critics, these differences are to become refined and shaped largely by Grossman's own experience of war.

II

Headlong retreat, almost a stampede, was Grossman's first experience of war, as the Germany Army remorselessly repeated the pattern of encirclement and piecemeal annihilation of the Russian armies. German successes could not be hidden and Grossman and his

fellow writers were faced with the unenviable task of trying to draw something positive from the disaster which surrounded them. Grossman endorses the view that Russia's greatest resource is her people. Numbers are important, but it is their moral superiority which distinguishes them from the Germans. In the end this will prove to be decisive. This is the central theme, reflected in the title, of Grossman's first significant wartime povest', Narod bessmertn. Towns may be destroyed; battles may be lost; and even leaders may come and go; but the people and their values will endure: they are immortal. It is they who will be the foundation of future victory, however distant it may seem in the summer of 1941.

Semen Ignat'ev, one of Grossman's most convincing portraits, embodies the depth and breadth of the national character. He possesses a mercurial spontaneity, is closely identified with the world of nature and more than any other character in Narod bessmertn symbolizes the emotions and feeling inherent in rodina or homeland.

Before the war Ignat'ev's life is essentially one of merry-making and womanizing. He is an unrepentant hedonist, described by Grossman as: 'Песенник, танцор, большой любитель выпить и погулять'.⁸ In his carefree attitude to life Ignat'ev is prescient of Tvardovskiy's Vasilii Terkin, and as one of his superiors observes: 'Русская твоя душа'.⁹ Conscripted into the army, Ignat'ev quickly adapts to the demands placed upon him. Tireless and capable of great sacrifice, Ignat'ev is ideal material for any army. In the Soviet Union's predicament his qualities are indispensable.

Yet there is a deeper side to Ignat'ev, a world of the spirit, which he shields from others. He has a large repertoire of songs and stories, rooted in the myths and legends of the Russian countryside, which he has learnt from Bogachikha, a solitary and retiring crone in his village. He undertakes long walks through his native forests, ostensibly to hunt. But his real reason is to enjoy the beauty of the countryside, and above all to be alone. These aimless peregrinations are part and parcel of Ignat'ev's spiritual life, which provide a form of sustenance: 'для меня по нашей земле ходить, как хлеб есть и воду пить'.¹⁰

Ignat'ev's deep love of the Russian countryside determines his feelings towards the German invasion. He experiences a sense of

emotional loss, even desecration. Observing the German occupation troops, Ignat'ev recalls his own village. A girl, who bears an uncanny resemblance to his sweetheart, Marusya, brings the Germans water. Images of home, violated by the Germans, flash before him, :

Страшная боль, горе, злоба сжали сердце Игнатьева. Никогда ни в эту ночь, когда немцы жгли город, ни глядя на разрушенные деревни, ни в смертном бою не испытывал Игнатьев такого чувства, как в этот светлый безоблачный день. Эти немцы, спокойно отдыхавшие в советской деревне, были страшней во много раз тех, в бою. 11

Frustration, disgust and outrage arise within the hero because of the Germans' assumption of normality. They relax and enjoy themselves in a manner akin to ordinary Russians; they have stolen the everyday life of the village.

Ignat'ev's courage and resourcefulness are put to the test during the preparations to break out of encirclement. Through his intimate knowledge of nature, he identifies those berries and wild foodstuffs which are of most use to the wounded. Bogarev, the unit's political commissar, admires Ignat'ev's qualities of leadership and holds him up as example for others to follow. Ignat'ev responds to the frequent sermons and lectures which Bogarev gives to the beleaguered troops. More importantly, war has changed him: 'Я словно другим человеком на этой войне стал'. 12 In the set-piece battle which ensues, Ignat'ev's changed perceptions manifest themselves in his resolve. Attacked by superior German forces the Russian infantry offers stiff resistance. Ignat'ev finds himself facing a German soldier in hand-to-hand fighting. The German is decisively beaten. Ignat'ev is pitiless: 'страшен и прост был удар русского солдата'. 13 The point is made that man for man the Russian is superior to his German counterpart, and thus that victory is inevitable.

Vignettes of a number of army officers in Narod bessmertn permit Grossman to address some of the specific reasons for the Soviet Army's failures. Among the junior officers Mertsalov and Myshanskiy are of interest. Mertsalov is a professional officer and Hero of the Soviet Union. His bravery is beyond question but some doubt exists as to his military competence. Under his command a local attack is carried out on some German positions. Tactical surprise is achieved.

Nevertheless, large numbers of Germans manage to escape because of badly coordinated ambushes and artillery support. This incident, and in particular its lessons, have wider implications for the Soviet Army as a whole. The quality of staff work and planning must be improved. Courage alone is insufficient.

Mertsalov's adaptation to the exigencies of modern warfare takes place under the tutelage of Bogarev and the senior Army commander, Samarin. Grossman tactfully suggests that the problem is confined to junior officers, but the sheer scale of the disaster points towards incompetence at the highest level. Mertsalov's preparations are suggestive of the new determination to improve and match the Germans. He burns his map, the one on which the continuous retreats of the Red Army have been marked since the beginning of the German invasion. Symbolic of the new determination, this action should not obscure the fact that while the Red Army did enjoy local successes, the overwhelming trend was retreat. Mertsalov pays scrupulous attention to his appearance. Having bathed himself, he dresses in clean clothing. Again the symbolism is apparent. He is a neophyte ready for his final ceremony of initiation. Mertsalov's recollections of his wife, his thoughts on the forthcoming battle and his painstaking toilette are apposite and convincing. However, his new found tactical awareness is less so.

Hitherto, Mertsalov has been portrayed as a reliable, but ponderous officer. He readily admits to prefer to lead his men into battle rather than be confined to his headquarters. The intellectual prowess which Mertsalov now manifests in his staff work is more applicable to Bogarev, his sternest critic. To quote V. Pertsov:

Это плохо вяжется с тем образом, который создается из же слов о себе - Я человек простой... Гораздо больше подходила бы такая картина к Богареву. 14

The essential elements in Mertsalov's biography which would make the transformation convincing are missing. In the final battle scene Mertsalov functions as an extension of the absent Bogarev. The arrival of Samarin and the divisional commissar Cherednichenko further highlights this. With evident anger, Samarin criticizes Mertsalov's planned withdrawal of tanks and infantry. Cherednichenko, however, supports the decision, expressing confidence in Mertsalov's

leadership. Cherednichenko is aware of Bogarev's earlier criticism of Mertsalov. His presence is a continuation of this influence, something which Mertsalov perceives too. Thus, the successful outcome of this engagement - the German commander Colonel Bruchmüller is defeated - is presented as being due to the guidance and example of the party, not to the professional officer corps.

Judgement as to whether this reflects a deliberate concession to wartime propaganda on Grossman's part or whether he has other aims in mind will for the moment be deferred. However, the following should be borne in mind. Army officers in the field frequently wished to implement tactical withdrawals. This was interpreted by the political organs as the prelude to desertion. Invariably such decisions were overruled. Tactical considerations were ignored. That Cherednichenko should support Mertsalov's decision to withdraw his tanks is totally inconsistent with what we know of the attitudes and functions of political commissars.

Samarin's silence is especially unconvincing. He has a reputation as a severe and ruthless commander, who does not hesitate to remove incompetent subordinates from their posts. He offers no counter-arguments to Cherednichenko's during this scene and, outwardly at any rate, tolerates the divisional commissar's insolent familiarity in front of a much junior officer.

From an inauspicious beginning Mertsalov progresses towards exemplary conduct, whereas Myshanskiy is disgraced and humiliated. His name is apt - it suggests mouse - since he appears to be daunted and psychologically overwhelmed by the Germans. Fear of the Germans and the lack of resolute leadership affect the men under his command. There is a general breakdown of military discipline and conduct; all fighting spirit is lost. During a brief and desperate engagement with the enemy Myshanskiy's company loses contact with Mertsalov. Mertsalov immediately suspects the worst and desertion is strongly implied. At this point a deserter is brought to Mertsalov's headquarters. Dressed in civilian clothes, he has hidden his uniform. He is executed on the spot. Unshaven and without rifles and badges of rank, Myshanskiy and his company eventually turn up. Bogarev threatens them with the same fate. Bogarev reduces Myshanskiy to the ranks and he is picked for especially dangerous missions as a

punishment for his timidity. Bogarev warns Myshanskiy not to fear the Germans, but to fear lack of resolve. Mertsalov echoes Bogarev, adding: 'Война была и будет искусством не бояться врага и смерти'. 15

Bogarev's harsh, if somewhat justified treatment of Myshanskiy, highlights the enviable flexibility which the Party enjoys. Cowardice, lack of leadership, and incompetence can always be attributed to an individual or group of individuals, whereas military success, as in the case of Ignat'ev and Mertsalov can be ascribed exclusively to the guiding, inspirational role of the political commissar.

Narod bessmertn is one of the first Soviet wartime works in which the question of collaboration is raised. Kotenko welcomes the German invasion as an opportunity to reap those rewards which, he feels, have been denied him under Soviet power. In essence he is driven by envy of others' success, particularly that of Mariya Timofeevna, a local woman who has benefited from the changes in Soviet society. Yet the Germans treat him with him obvious contempt. He has nothing to offer and they dismiss him out of hand. His grovelling behaviour is in striking contrast to the proud and angry Mariya Timofeevna, who for her defiance is shot. With her death Kotenko realises his mistake. Envy turns to admiration and deeply regretting his treachery, he commits suicide.

Grossman's presentation of collaboration is unusual. Of course he condemns collaboration, but Kotenko dies by his own hand. Suicide partly expiates the treachery. It is the sin, not the sinner Grossman finds so loathsome. Thus Grossman exhibits a remarkably tolerant view for a country in the midst of war. Yet the wider issues of collaboration are raised and in this respect it probably does not amount to a coincidence that the names - Kotenko, Grishchenko and Cherednichenko - suggest the Ukraine. Large parts of the Ukraine were quickly overrun by the Germans, who were often rapturously received with the traditional bread and salt. Later in the war Ukrainian collaboration was to become a serious issue for Grossman, and one which was to have profound personal consequences for him.

Propagandistic purpose reveals itself in Grossman's portrayal of the German enemy, though it lacks the vitriol of Ehrenburg, and the Germans in Grossman odious enough, are not quite as bad as those in

Sholokhov's Nauka nenavisti. However Grossman's attempts at propaganda are not entirely successful. Consider the description of German troops entering a Russian village:

Вошла орда...

...и словно стыдясь современных машин, созданных, вопреки им европейских наукой и трудом, фашисты намалевали на них символы своей жестокой дикости - медведей, волков, лис, драконов, человеческие черепа с переkreщенными костями. 16

Grossman's attempt to isolate the Germans from the mainstream of European technological progress lacks sophistication even by wartime standards. As a chemist Grossman would have been well aware of Germany's contribution to science and industry. Discerning Soviet readers would also find Grossman's stance difficult to reconcile with the obvious respect for German achievement in "Glück auf!", the very title of which betrays its German origins. Grossman's lie is too obvious. It betrays perhaps the author's lack of conviction in what he writes.

Other attempts are more convincing. Underlining German rapacity, Grossman writes the following:

И, казалось, раздайся с неба гром - и его бы заглушило это могучее торопливое чавканье сотен мерно, весело жующих немецких солдат. 17

Here the effect is one of disgust. The Germans resemble a plague of locusts. Were this representative of Grossman's general approach towards the Germans in Narod bessmerten he would at least achieve some degree of consistency. Inconsistencies reflect Grossman's ambivalence regarding the nature of the beast, which confronts him.

Narod bessmerten was welcomed by Soviet critics. Writing in 1943, soon after its publication, A. Lavretskiy described it as, . . . 'одно из наиболее вдумчивых, человеческих по чувству и благородных по стилю произведений наших дней'. 18 In fact it made such an impression that according to Nataliya Roskina it was put forward for the Stalin prize 19 only to be deleted from the list of candidates, as Stepan Kol'chugin had been, on Stalin's orders. Nor did publication pass unnoticed abroad. The special correspondent of The Times called Narod bessmerten, . . . 'a remarkable interpretation of the Red Army's mood during the 1941 retreat'. 20 Whereas a review in the Mexican magazine

Futuro saw Narod bessmerten as a rebuttal of any Remarquist sentiments:

Когда придут книги новых Ремарков или Барбюсов, мы вернемся к страстным страницам Ванды Василевской и Василия Гроссмана, чтобы быть снова ослепленными высотой их человечности. 21

There is humanity in Remarque, which is not at odds with Grossman. But the assessment of Narod bessmerten is substantially correct. Grossman's belief in victory is total and this sense of commitment and passion inform his prose in a way which is undetectable in Remarque.

III

Narod bessmerten marked the beginning of Grossman's reputation as a serious writer on the war theme. Stalingrad consolidated it, widening his audience at home and abroad. The admiration and gratitude felt by all as the Russians turned disaster into victory were in no small measure due to Vasiliy Grossman's reportage.

The advanced elements of Von Paulus's 6th Army reached Stalingrad in August 1942. A superbly equipped and battle-hardened army, it seemed that in the face of such opposition Russian resistance would crumble as easily as it had done throughout the summer. However, the armoured and aerial battering ram by means of which Von Paulus and Von Richthofen hoped to secure a quick and decisive victory before the onset of winter, faltered. Russian resistance stiffened and a period of bitter street fighting ensued. Both sides sustained heavy losses. On 19th November 1942 the Russians launched their counter-offensive. Encircled and beyond the help of other German units, the 6th Army surrendered on 3rd February 1943.

The static nature of the Stalingrad battle offered excellent opportunities for war correspondents. Among those present were Konstantin Simonov, Leonid Kondravatykh, Leonid Vysokoostrovskiy, Petr Kolomeytsev, Efim Gekhman and Pavel Milovanov. With the possible exception of Simonov - none, however, have become so closely identified with Stalingrad as Grossman.

Just how long Grossman spent in Stalingrad seems to be in dispute. General Ortenberg, Grossman's superior, the editor of Krasnaya zvezda, says that he spent several months there. 22 Alexander Werth, who was

in Russia for the duration of the battle, and a voracious collector of gossip and anecdotes, maintains that Grossman was present throughout the battle.²³ Doubt is cast upon these two claims by Shimon Markish. Markish quotes Ehrenburg, who in an article discussing Grossman's sketches draws attention to the fact that Grossman was denied the opportunity of witnessing the battle's conclusion, having been earlier sent to Elista, an outpost in the steppes.²⁴ The last of Grossman's sketches "Stalingradskiy front" is dated December 1942, that is, well over a month before the final German collapse. This together with the fact that no precise coverage of the German surrender can be found in any of the sketches - a moment that any war correspondent would surely wish to see - suggests that Ehrenburg is correct.

In all, Grossman wrote thirteen sketches or ocherki for Krasnaya zvezda. Eventually in 1943 they were published in a single volume under the title Stalingrad. This gives some idea of Grossman's popularity and standing as a war correspondent, which is supported by Ortenberg:

Его очерки в « Красной звезде » каждый раз являлись в своем роде сенсацией и нередко перепечатывались « Правдой » - это было признанием их значительности и актуальности.²⁵

Nor was Grossman's popularity confined to the rear. Viktor Nekrasov, who served in the 79th Guards Motor Rifle Division at Stalingrad bears witness to the respect enjoyed by Grossman among the frontline troops:

. . .газеты с его, как и Эренбурга, корреспонденциями зачитывались у нас до дыр.²⁶

The Stalingrad sketches fall naturally into two parts. This reflects the tenacious and ferociously contested defensive phase and the subsequent Russian counter-attack. In the first phase, in keeping with its defensive character, Grossman seeks to demonstrate the commitment and resilience of the Russian soldier. Soldiers in these sketches stand out as archetypes; yet they are not wooden or unconvincing. Grossman captures their distinct individuality and humanity, while simultaneously underlining their shared aspirations and motivation. His many vignettes were accorded the accolade of 'правдивость'.²⁷

"Through Chekhov's Eyes" ("Glazami Chekhova"; 1942), "Vlasov"

("Vlasov"; 1942) and "A Red Army Man's Soul" ("Dusha krasnoarmeytsa"; 1942) are excellent examples of Grossman's method in characterization. All three heroes in these sketches have different military duties, and in all of them Grossman stresses continuity in the transition from peace to war. Probity, application in the acquisition of new skills, determination, toughness and self-discipline are as much part of their pre-war lives as in their military service.

"Glazami Chekhova" is based on the exploits of Anatoliy Chekhov, one of the many famous Stalingrad snipers. Sniping played a vital role in the defensive phase of the battle and is therefore a useful theme for a war correspondent. Grossman manages to impart some of the peculiarities of the sniper's deadly work. From his observation post Chekhov is master of all he surveys. Yet there is an unmistakable air of menace; nothing is quite what it seems:

Много дней и много ночей эти всевидящие глаза смотрят с пятого этажа разрушенного дома на город. Эти глаза видят улицу, площадь, десятки домов с проваливавшимися полами, пустые мертвые коробки, полные обманчивой тишины. 28

Furthermore, Grossman demonstrates acute understanding of the technical aspects involved in sniping: marksmanship; observation; the ability to judge distances; fieldcraft and infinite patience. Such knowledge could only have been gained by spending time in the company of men like Chekhov, watching and studying them at work. Details of this kind enhance the sketch's veracity.

So too does its psychological penetration. Chekhov must overcome any feelings of remorse when he kills. It is to Grossman's credit that he does not eschew this vital aspect in the process of execution. For all the insufferable arrogance and brutality of the Germans, at the first opportunity Chekhov cannot bring himself to kill:

По пустынной улице шли два немецких солдата. Они остановились в ста метрах от того места, где сидел Чехов. Четыре минуты юноша смотрел на немцев. Он медлил. Это странное чувство нерешительности знакомо почти всем снайперам перед первым выстрелом. 29

After much thought Chekhov manages to suppress any misgivings. Even then the first kill is not easy psychologically:

..., он отнес прицел от носа солдата на четыре сантиметра

вперед и выстрелил. Из-под пилотки мелькнуло что-то темное, голова мотнулась назад, ведро выпало из рук, солдат упал на бок. Чекова затрясало. 30

Grossman's language is precise, sparse, perfectly suited to the mechanistic sequence of the shot. It is an exact physical description. Chekhov is shaken, and something of his mood conveys itself to the reader, who sees the kill as it were 'through Chekhov's eyes'. There is too the suggestion that although Chekhov's grim work may be compatible with the, . . . 'железная, святая логика Отечественной Войны' 31, the personal legacy will be immense.

Reading about Chekhov the sniper, we recall Chekhov the writer. Given the tenderness and compassion which we associate with the latter there is a grim irony in the fact that the name Chekhov should also be the name of one of Russia's most proficient killers.

"Dusha krasnoarmeytsa" arose from a conversation with General Malinovskiy. Grossman had visited his headquarters just after a heavy German attack had been repulsed. The unit's bravery should, Malinovskiy suggested, be acknowledged. 32 Before writing this particular sketch Grossman familiarised himself thoroughly with the unit in question. The result, as in the case of "Glazami Chekhova" is a credible account of one man's war and what it is like to face a tank attack.

Gromov, the subject of this sketch, epitomizes the anti-tank gunner. Scornful of comfort, tenacious and taciturn, Gromov's energies are devoted to the care and maintenance of his gun. Both gun and gunner exude power and reliability:

Он верил в силу своего огромного ружья-пушки, он прощал его вес и вечером, после чудовищного напряжения сил, никогда относился к ружью небрежно или с раздражением. Он терпеливо и внимательно очищал тряпочкой побелешей от пыли ствол, медленно и любовно, смазывал замок. 33

Gromov's motivation, consistent with the main thrust of Soviet wartime literature, is entirely convincing:

Он видел сожженные деревни, навстречу ему по пыльным дорогам тащились телеги беженцев, он видел старух и стариков, . . . он видел невинную кровь, он слышал странные простые рассказы, которые были правдой от

первого до последнего слова. 34

Images of burnt out villages, refugees and the slaughter of civilians remind one of the cold fury of Aleksey Surkov's poems. Gromov's anger is not exclusively aimed at the Germans. There is frustration and impatience with his own side:

Он наполнялся тяжелой злобой и безжалостно осуждал в своем сердце все ошибки начальства, все проявления солдатской нестойкости. 35

Patience and the ability to endure are, as Grossman acknowledges, as much a part of Gromov's heroism as his bravery in battle. Desperately waiting for a miracle, the Russian people hoped that their endurance and patience would soon be rewarded.

Gromov's baptism of fire is realistic and the image of the phlegmatic anti-tank gunner, which Grossman seeks to create, succeeds. Gromov tells his own story, the authenticity of which is enhanced by Grossman's decision to retain the solecisms in grammar:

Пошли в мою сторону четыре танки.

...Ну дал я по ней..., огонь синий по броне прошел, как искра, быстрый... Закричали внутри немцы, так кричали. Я в жизни такого крику не слышал. 36

Lest the full force of what is happening should escape us, the screams remind us that the Germans are dying in agony, incinerated inside their own tank. Unlike Chekhov, Gromov feels no remorse, the screams are of interest because of their novelty value. Exulted, Gromov feels triumph and pride. Fear and danger, and particularly the fearsome reputation of the Germans, have been conquered:

и так дух радуется, прямо не было со мной такого. Все му свету в глаза смотреть могу. Осилил я. А то день и ночь меня мучило: неужели меня сильнее... 37

Research for Grossman's sketches involved considerable personal risk. Not content to rely on second hand reports, Grossman sought out the precise details, satisfying himself as to their accuracy. As he told Boris Yampolskiy: 'Я пишу только то, что видел, а выдумать я могу бы что угодно'. 38 Other considerations prompted Grossman to run the risks for information that he did. He made this quite clear to Leonid Kondrevatykh, the special correspondent of Izvestiya at Stalingrad:

Чтобы писать о Сталинградской битве, надо побывать там
на правом берегу Волги, среди тех, кто дерется на
развалинах, на прибрежных песках. Пока я не побывал там
я не имею морального права писать о защитниках
Сталинграда. 39

In writing "Vlasov" Grossman meets his self-imposed requirements to the full.

Grossman moves from the general to the specific. Before introducing Vlasov, Grossman sets the scene in which Vlasov and his fellow pontoniers must work. Because of intensive and accurate German artillery fire and air attacks most of the trips are carried out under cover of darkness. Occasionally however - so critical is the situation - trips in daylight are unavoidable. Then the pontoniers must run the full gauntlet of German fire. Casualties in men and stores are heavy. Yet the link is vital for the defence of the city. Ammunition, food, reinforcements and the evacuation of wounded all depend on the link being kept open. In the light of this it is not difficult to see why Ortenberg described Vlasov's deeds as 'готовая фабула'. 40

Combined peacetime labour and wartime duty are a more pronounced motif than in the two previous sketches. Vlasov combines soldier and worker, the . . . 'тяжкая будничная работа русского рабочего с доблестью солдата'. 41 This is true in another sense: the ferry maintains a symbolic link between Stalingrad and the rest of the Soviet Union.

Shared dangers and the awareness that a vital task is being performed engender strong feelings of loyalty. Grossman recounts the episode in which two soldiers, Volkov and Luk'yanov are badly wounded. Sent to hospital, they discharge themselves prematurely and return to their duties. One is tempted to dismiss such alleged bravery out of hand. However, plainly stated and without protestations of loyalty to Stalin and Party, it exemplifies Grossman's, . . . 'non-political interpretation of the source of military loyalty'. 42

Furthermore, the pontoniers' spiritual life - always important in Grossman's soldiers - maintains the continuity with peacetime:

Когда читаешь воспоминания о войне французов, англичан,
американцев, все они пишут, что на войне, в бою, они

становятся иными, что весь душевный мир изменяется, что они переоценивают все ценности, что казавшиеся им дорогим и близким становятся ненужным, далеким. 43

Such sentiments would appear to disassociate Grossman quite sharply from Remarque and his western contemporaries such as Hemingway, Barbusse and Aldington. (Although, curiously enough no mention is made of German authors, we may perhaps assume that Remarque is to be included as well). However, Grossman's observations need to be qualified.

For the western participants World War One was a bloody and brutal interruption in the process of wealth creation. Compared with earlier European wars, it was utterly unprecedented. Of course the consequences were equally grim for Russia; more so perhaps. But the end of World War One brought no relief. Intervention and Civil war quickly followed.

Underlying Grossman's point - and it is a valid one - is the knowledge that life in Russia before 1941 was for the bulk of the population almost as grim as the war years. Hence, for many, the transition was minimal. For some, as Pasternak underlines in the epilogue of Dr Zhivago, it brought relief from persecution. Those lucky enough to have survived collectivisation and the Terror would hardly regard these experiences as 'remote and superfluous'. The privations of the pre-war years enjoyed the dubious distinction of being self-inflicted. The Germans were an external threat and cause of suffering. Nobody was spared. That which had been built up at great cost before the war now seemed on the threshold of total annihilation. Russia herself seemed doomed. Few Russians, whatever they felt about Stalin, could remain indifferent to this possibility.

Vlasov embodies more than the, 'особенные черты большого дела'. 44 According to Grossman he personifies the harsher side of the Russian character, which comes to the fore in time of crisis:

Они, Власовы - выразители не доброты и мягкости
народного характера, они - носители суровости,
непримиримости, неистребимой, неистовой силы русской
народной души. 45

Vlasov's ruthlessness manifests itself in his treatment of cowards. A close comrade refuses to disembark on the far beach of the Volga to

effect repairs on the damaged wharf. Subsequently, in front of the unit Vlasov himself carries out the execution. His own bravery is beyond doubt. During a crossing of the Volga in daylight the ferry is punctured below the waterline. Vlasov amid scenes of great panic blocks the hole with his greatcoat. Men and ship are saved. The incident, insists Ortenberg, was not invented and Grossman accurately records what took place.⁴⁶

Anatoliy Bocharov asserts that in the Stalingrad cycle Grossman, . . . 'ищет коренной советский, русский тип'.⁴⁷ Vlasov is clearly one of the sketches he has in mind. Bocharov adduces four factors, which he says, explain the heroism of the defenders: personal psychological profile; the demands of comradeship; national characteristics and traditions; and socio-class factors.⁴⁸ One finds no difficulty in accommodating the first two to what we know of Vlasov. Problems for Bocharov's schema arise when one considers the specific epithets used by Grossman when qualifying Vlasov. On two occasions he uses an adjective derived from the name of the heretic Petrovich Avvakum. Vlasov is described as a, 'человек, могучей аввакумовской души' ⁴⁹, of which Grossman says further, 'эту железную аввакумовскую породу невозможно ни согнуть, ни сломать'.⁵⁰ It can be seen that Grossman's use of avvakumovskiy cannot easily be reconciled with the search for a Soviet Russian type. Avvakum's resilience and determination owe nothing to the Soviet era. General Eremenko, one of the senior commanders at Stalingrad, confirms these distinctly Russian features. In an interview with Grossman in "Stalingradskiy Front" ("The Stalingrad Front") he says:

Здесь в Сталинграде нам красноармеец показал всю силу
и зрелость русского народного духа'.⁵¹

Indirectly, Bocharov lends support to this view. The national factor in heroism depends, . . . 'От вековых традиций народа'.⁵² Thus to ascribe such importance to socio-class factors - as Bocharov does - is to overstate grossly their significance, since they are not part of the age old traditions of the Russian people. History, tradition and legend mattered more than class.

The latter half of September 1942 marks the beginning of what has become known as the Stalingrad legend.⁵³ The birth of this legend coincided with the deployment of Rodimtsev's division. Both his men

and he, much to the irritation of other commanders, were the subject of intense scrutiny in the press. "The Stalingrad Battle" ("Stalingradskaya bitva"; 1942) is Grossman's contribution.

The choice of Rodimtsev is deliberate. His military experience and credentials are admirably suited to make him the focal point of the legend. Grossman describes him thus:

За время войны Родимцеву пришлось пройти через много испытаний. Его дивизия дралась под Киевом, она выбивала из Сталинки прорвавшиеся эсэсовские полки ... умение наступать когда всякому другому кажется, что о наступлении мечтать нельзя, тактическая опытность и осторожность, сочетающиеся с тактическим и личным бесстрашием, - черты военного характера молодого генерала стал характером его дивизии. 54

Grossman's portrait is generally optimistic. It suggests that with such a man at the helm all is not lost. That Rodimtsev's division had denied Stalinka to an SS division was undoubtedly welcome. But for the Germans this was no more than a temporary setback, a minor gain for the Russians. The underlying message is one of realism. Kiev, for example, fell early in 1941 and like many early battles was an unmitigated disaster. Rodimtsev is not directly implicated in this débâcle. Nevertheless, Grossman makes the point that his men and he were forced to retreat; they are not supermen.

Emphasis on Rodimtsev's offensive spirit and his tactical skill reflected the concern in the Soviet press that there were too many tactically ineffective commanders in the Red Army. This theme was taken up by Korneychuk in the play Front (1942). Korneychuk is crude in his approach. Officers fall into one of two groups: efficient or hopelessly incompetent. Grossman does not follow Korneychuk's simplistic line and in Zhizn' i sud'ba condemns it.⁵⁵ Even the most able of commanders, among them Rodimtsev, can find themselves encircled and in retreat.

"Stalingradskaya bitva" contains a wealth of detailed information on the peculiarities of the battle: the extreme proximity of the enemy trenches, in some cases as little as 20 metres (Rodimtsev's divisional headquarters was only 250 metres from the front line); and the many isolated sub-units in touch by radio, but essentially fighting their

own war. Promoting the ethos of the Rodimtsev division, Grossman emphasises the special difficulties with which the division must grapple. In this respect some of Grossman's sketches are undoubtedly valuable for the military historian. House to house fighting, the predominant combat experience at Stalingrad, what Grossman calls, 'своеобразнейшее дело' 56, is a case in point:

План штурма меня поразил множеством деталей, сложностью разработкой. На аккуратно сделанном чертеже был нанесен дом и все соседние постройки. Условные знаки показывали, что на втором этаже в третьем окне находится ручной пулемет, на третьем этаже в двух окнах сидят снайперы, а в одном расположен станковый пулемет... У каждого рода оружия была своя задача, строго сопряженная с общей целью. 57

War reportage, no matter how accurate or sensitive, is always limited in its ability to portray the full horrors, even more so when the writer must cope with censorship. Notwithstanding these restrictions imposed by genre and officialdom, Grossman is generally more effective than most. 58

Military jargon itself tends towards censorship. Battles and place names as they are depicted on maps represent the language of the staff officer and planner. Accounts of death and injury are sanitized. This was particularly true of Mamaev kurgan, the dominant topographical feature in Stalingrad, and one for which thousands of German and Russian soldiers perished in protracted hand-to-hand battles. The Russian name proved grimly apt; the kurgan was indeed a burial mound.

On the planners' maps Mamaev kurgan is referred to as a spot height, a dominant feature, 'господствующая высота'. 59 For Grossman these are, 'страшные слова'. 60 They tell us nothing of the mutual slaughter. His bleak description goes some way towards amending our perception:

Много тяжелых слез прольют по всей России о погибших в боях за курган. Не дешево далась гвардейцам эта битва. Красным курганом назовут его... 61

Grossman portrays a nightmarish world of twisted and burnt metal:

Железным курганом назовут его - весь покрылся он колючей чешуей минных и снарядных осколков, хвостами -

стабилизаторами германских авиационных бомб, темными от пороховой копоти гильзами, рубчатым рваным кусками гранат, тяжелым стальным тушами развороченных германских танков. 62

Dazed by the grotesque architecture and the preponderance of metal, we lose sight of the fact that this is the work of man. Yet, in this forbidding landscape, scattered with the detritus of modern war, there seems to be no place for him. How is it possible for soldiers to survive in this maelstrom of steel and thunder, in which tanks are effortlessly overturned and grenade fragments scar and deface everything? Imperceptibly, with growing horror, we begin to acquire some idea of what took place on Mamaev kurgan, as Grossman partially draws back the veil, which obscures a vision of hell.

Not all Russian soldiers perform their duties as effectively and honourably as Chekhov, Gromov, Vlasov and Rodimtsev's men. In "A Company of Young Sub-Machine Gunners" ("Rota molodykh avtomatchikov"; 1942) Grossman briefly touches upon the question of cowardice. During a close quarter battle encounter, a junior sergeant, Roganov, deserts his comrades. In striking contrast to the majority of cases reported in the Soviet wartime press, Grossman does not pass judgement. That is left to Roganov's comrades.

и никто в мире не имел большего права произнести эти жестокие слова, чем они. 63

Like Vlasov, only they have the right to carry out the ultimate sentence. There is here an implied rebuke, directed at those who themselves have not had to overcome fear, but are quick to castigate others who succumb. Roganov's desertion is primarily a mistake: 'Лучше потерять жизнь в бою, чем потерять уважение и любовь.' 64 This is hardly a conventional approach to desertion. Roganov's cowardice is not seen as betrayal of Stalin, or even of Russia, but as a violation of the sacred code of comradeship.

Similarly in "Stalingradskiy front" Grossman hints that the long retreat to the Volga was too much for some:

Бывали минуты, когда люди забывали о доме, о своей силе, о своем грозном оружии, и мутное чувство овладевало ими. 65

Sober realism of this kind may explain why this sketch was not published, or possibly not even written until December 1942. By this

time the fate of the German 6th Army was sealed. Cowardice and disaster are easier to accept from a position of strength.

Fresh insights into Grossman's attitude towards this theme are provided by his daughter.⁶⁶ They lend support to the above conclusions. During the war Ortenberg set A. Tolstoy, P. Pavlenko and Grossman the task of writing a sketch or rasskaz on the theme of desertion. Grossman refused. Cowardice and desertion, he argued, represented a momentary loss of nerve, not an irremediable flaw. Thus, he refused to condemn out of hand those who had briefly capitulated. This is consistent with his silence in "Vlasov" and his muted criticism in "Rota molodykh avtomatchikov".

It should be noted that in the period from the 20th September 1942 until the appearance of "Vlasov" on 1st November 1942 Grossman publishes nothing. Entries in his field notebooks attest the unremitting ferocity of the fighting over this period. Not intended for publication during the war, they are a valuable supplement to the more formal sketches. Undoubtedly this was the decisive phase:

Никто не выходил из оборонительных боев. Гибли на месте.

Кульминация боев 17 октября.⁶⁷

Similarly:

Занимаем дом, нас до 20 человек, гранатный бой, бой за этаж, бой за ступеньки, за коридоры, за метры комнат.⁶⁸

Tense and abrupt, these entries make grim, yet fascinating reading on the scale of fighting and dying in Stalingrad. Indeed, one wonders whether Grossman wrote them from the perspective of participant or observer. There is very little to choose between Grossman's account and that of a German officer:

We have fought fifteen days for a single house... Already, by the third day, fifty four German corpses were strewn in the cellars, on the landings and the staircases... Ask any soldier what half an hour of hand-to-hand struggle means. Then imagine Stalingrad: eighty days and nights in hand to hand struggles. Animals flee this hell; the hardest stones cannot bear it for long; only men endure.⁶⁹

Grossman's experiences at this juncture of the battle provide the basis for one of the most successful pieces of wartime writing in the Soviet Union. Published, significantly on the same day as the Russian

counter-offensive, "The Direction of the Main Blow" ("Napravlenie glavnogo udara"; 1942) records the desperate efforts of the German juggernaut to smash the Russian defence, and the equally desperate, almost suicidal bravery of the Russians who stopped them.

Grossman's language and style attempt to translate the power of the German assault:

Здесь был собран весь дьявольский арсенал германского милитаризма.

Здесь автоматчиков снабдили разрывными пулями.

Здесь бросали мины...

Здесь ночью светло от пожаров и ракет, здесь днем было темно от дыма горящих зданий.

Здесь грохот был плотен, как земля. 70

Repeated nine times on one page, zdes' effectively conveys the overwhelming concentration of men and material. Moreover, its repetition suggests the concentrically exploding shock waves of bombs and shells, which reverberate outwards, only to rebound back to the point of origin, and then to explode outwards again with increased strength. The overall effect is of a battering ram, indefatigable, remorseless, and determined to pulverize the hapless defenders.

Concerted German air attacks make the battle three-dimensional:

тот, кто слышал вопль воздуха, раскаленного авиационной бомбой, тот, кто пережил напряжение стремительного десятиминутного налета немецкой авиации, тот поймет, что такое восемь часов интенсивной воздушной бомбежки пикирующих бомбировщиков. 71

Emotions, logic and our senses are stretched to their limit. We cannot judge this battle in the way we would others. It marks a new threshold in destructive power, savagery and violence.

No quarter was given or expected in the fighting among the rubble, in the buildings or on the streets:

Этот невиданный по ожесточенности бой, длился, не переставая, несколько суток, ... он шел за каждую отдельную ступеньку, лестницу, за угол в тесном коридоре... Не один человек не отступил в этом бою. 72

There are some obvious parallels between this passage and that from the notebooks quoted earlier. This would indicate that Grossman

avoided the temptation to embellish. In fact any suggestion that he did is firmly rebutted by Alexander Werth. Having visited the battlefield, particularly the ruins of the Red October plant, Werth wrote:

. . . 'every square yard of ground was like a scream of human agony, where earth and steel girders and bricks and human flesh and Russian and German uniforms seemed to be rolled into one monstrous ball... 73

As a result Werth arrives at the unusual conclusion that, . . . 'Grossman's story seems almost mild'. 74 What exactly Werth finds mild in Grossman's account is difficult to see. Nevertheless, drawing on his conversations with Russians, Werth asserts that Grossman had deliberately toned down certain aspects:

The blood and horror of it all was greater, and as a test of endurance it was even more astonishing than Grossman suggested. 75

For non-participants the scale of the slaughter is almost impossible to understand. This exposes a limitation of language rather than Grossman. With regard to the magnificent endurance of the defenders, and as a corollary the awesome offensive spirit of the Germans, Grossman succeeds completely. The extracts considered above bear ample witness to this.

The impact of "Napravlenie glavnogo udara" was considerable. Alexander Rozen recalls reading it in Leningrad:

Я прочел все до конца и потом прочел еще раз от начала до конца, медленно, вчитываясь в каждую букву. Я отошел от газеты потрясенный. 76

Even Stalin forgot his customary vindictiveness towards Grossman, ordering the sketch to be reprinted in Pravda. 77

"Napravlenie glavnogo udara" is a fitting conclusion to Grossman's coverage of the defensive phase. Written while the German pocket was slowly being reduced, the remaining sketches lack the urgency of the earlier ones. Their tone is more reflective. Strictly speaking, since the focal point of these sketches is still the defenders inside the city, one can still speak of them as being defence-oriented. But the outcome of the battle is no longer in doubt.

These later sketches may be seen as a final tribute to the

defenders, whose endurance held the Germans and made the counter-offensive a feasible option for the Soviet High Command. "'Along the Roads of the Offensive" ("Po dorogam nastupleniya"; 1942), "A New Day" ("Novyy den'"; 1942) and "The Military Council" ("Voennyi sovet"; 1942) belong to this category.

The fruits of impending victory are apparent in "Po dorogam nastupleniya". The very title is optimistic after the long period in the ruins. At last Soviet troops have taken the offensive, capturing large numbers of Rumanian prisoners in the preliminary phase. Optimism and the new spirit of confidence are very much evident in "Novyy den'" and "Voennyi sovet", as the title of the former suggests. Grossman acknowledges the contribution of the commanders, who in the early days rallied the defenders. In particular Chuykov receives special praise:

Для этого человека оборона Сталинграда не была одной лишь военной проблемой, пусть первостепенного стратегического значения. Он переживал и ощущал романтику этой битвы, жестокую и мрачную красоту ее, поэзию войны, поэзию смертной обороны, к которой он обзывал железным приказом командиров и красноармейцев. 78

In "Stalingradskiy front" anticipation of final victory cannot completely overshadow the memories of early August. This was a time of shame: 'Великая армия великого народа отступала'. 79 Eremenko's appointment as front commander, was, according to Grossman, decisive. In him were combined both the defensive and offensive spirit of the Russian army. A less obvious aim underlies this description. It implies that the decision to launch a counter-offensive had already been taken as early as August 1942; that, therefore, the defence of the city was part of the overall plan, rather than a hastily organised and chaotic sequel to the summer rout.

Yet for all the recognition of Eremenko, Rodimtsev and Chuykov and their formal military skills, the view that the victory was a 'чудо' 80 lingers. It is fitting that homage to the fallen should reflect this. Played on an old record player in one of the dugouts, the music of Beethoven strikes Grossman as profoundly relevant. The music expresses, in a way in which words never could, the joy in triumph over moral and physical adversity, a sense of anti-climax, and

nostalgia to be found in victory. Wellington's words come to mind: 'There is nothing half so melancholy as a battle won. . . unless it be a battle lost'. Grossman compares the solemn attentiveness of the Russian soldiers to the music to that of a church service. This is a requiem of extraordinary grandeur and nobility, in Grossman's words, 'благородная печаль'.⁸¹ It is not difficult to see why Grossman should describe this scene as, . . . 'одно из самых больших переживаний войны'.⁸² It is indeed a worthy epitaph:

Под эту песню в полутьме подвала торжественно и выпукло
вспоминались десятки людей сталинградской обороны, людей,
выразивших все величие народной души.⁸³

Beethoven's music confirms the affinity of great art and suffering. Artistic creation at the highest level and the endurance of the Russian soldiers represent the triumph of the human spirit. This is hardly a conventional view of art in the Soviet context and justifies one observation of Grossman's sketches that they are imbued with the 'колорит трагизма'.⁸⁴

Anatoliy Bocharov has called the Stalingrad sketches the, 'вершина военной публицистикой Гроссмана' ⁸⁵, a comment which was shared in wartime Russia.⁸⁶ A. Derman's evaluation is the most perceptive. Acknowledging Grossman's achievement, he suggests that new standards have been set in the genre:

Очерк Гроссмана, эта - казалось бы, по самому своему
заданию - литературная однодневка, далеко выступил за
пределы, положенные ему по рангу.⁸⁷

Derman also recognizes the, 'незаурядное значение' ⁸⁸ of Grossman's sketches from the military point of view, adding that:

, . . . 'что с точки зрения философии истории военные очерки
Гроссмана представляются в известной степени односторонними,
и притом характерно односторонними'.⁸⁹

Derman identifies a key element in Grossman's art; the distinctive philosophical bent which he brings to the interpretation of history. It imparts a character to Grossman's sketches which is unique in Soviet wartime journalism.

Grossman's observations of military life and active service in the Stalingrad cycle have been compared with Tolstoy's Sevastopol Stories. Writing in the wartime journal, Literatura i iskusstvo, the critic M.

Kuznetsov has made the following comment on the relationship between Tolstoy and Grossman:

Оба описывают героические страницы жизни своего народа и
оба ищут те глубокие черты национального характера, которые
проявились в эти критические моменты истории. 90

In many respects the comparison with Tolstoy is valid. Grossman's main themes are comradeship, courage, duty, self-sacrifice and Russian nationalism. Moreover, both authors were intimately involved in the battles they describe. That Grossman was nominally a non-combatant, unlike Tolstoy, did not diminish his chances of death or serious injury. Both authors wrote about the grim conditions in which the fighting took place, and both eschew jingoism.

A further parallel exists in the overlapping roles of both writers. At Stalingrad Grossman's duties as a war correspondent became virtually indistinguishable from those of some officers, while Tolstoy, before being transferred to Sevastopol had sought to produce a journal for the troops. According to R. F. Christian this is significant for the Sevastopol Stories:

The element of reportage, the eye witness account, the diary, the notes of a war correspondent which we find in The Raid and Wood Felling, play an important role also in the three Sevastopol Stories. 91

There are some significant differences too. Although the internal political repercussions of the Crimean campaign were considerable - the movement for reform, in particular the abolition of serfdom, gained new momentum - it cannot be said that Tsarist Russia was in any grave danger of being overrun by the Anglo-French forces. In 1942 Russia's situation was far worse; the arrival of the German 6th Army at Stalingrad was indicative of this. Vast areas of land had been captured, large centres of industry knocked out, and hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers were either dead, or dying in captivity. An entry in Grossman's notebook for 1942 is blunt: 'конец нам. Дошел он жулик до коренной нашей земли'. 92 Such an atmosphere of doom is absent in the Sevastopol Stories.

Concluding "Sevastopol in May", Tolstoy wrote that the hero of his povest was the truth. 93 Subsequently, the manner in which writers deal with the sordid and unglamorous aspects of war, not concentrating

exclusively on acts of bravery, has become an important criterion in Russian or Soviet war literature. Grossman's reportage in the Stalingrad cycle does not entirely measure up to the severe standard set by Tolstoy's much quoted line.

There are for example no strident criticisms of the military leadership. Nor do we find the grim naturalistic detail of the casualty clearing station. These are noticeable lacunae. In a recent study on war correspondents we find the less than flattering comment on Grossman's sketches:

Grossman's literary style tended to be flowery and his dispatches of little use to Western correspondents hungry for facts. 94

How strong then is the assertion of kinship with regard to the Sevastopol Stories and the Stalingrad sketches? Like all war correspondents, Allied or Axis, Grossman's reports were subject to rigorous military censorship (Tolstoy had his problems with the censors 95). It needs, too, to be appreciated that Grossman covered the greater part of the battle. The majority of Western correspondents were not allowed anywhere near the frontline until after the German capitulation, and then only under strict escort. Grossman's diaries and ocherki comprise, therefore, a valuable, if somewhat incomplete historical source. As a literary source, they comprise the incunabula of characters, scenes and themes which are developed at greater length in Za pravoe delo and Zhizn' i sud'ba. Themes first discussed in the Sevastopol Stories undergo a similar evolution in the creation of War and Peace.

Furthermore, is war reportage merely the presentation of factual evidence? Combat journalism, inevitably and desirably so, includes the reporter's impressions; it represents a combination of fact, analysis and description. Operating within the stringent parameters of military censorship, Grossman concentrates the thrust of his reporting on personalities, their hopes and fears, morale and the peculiarities of street fighting, what today's journalist would refer to as 'colour pieces'. 96

Grossman's main achievement in the Stalingrad sketches is the evocation of the defenders' remarkable spirit, the 'Сталинградский дух'. He wholeheartedly vindicates Tolstoy's belief in the vital and

decisive role of morale, in Tolstoy's lexicon, the nation's, 'скрытая теплота'.⁹⁷ Grossman suggests that it was this as much as tanks and guns which stopped Hitler on the Volga. In his post-war prose it provides one of the essential foundations for Grossman's explicit criticisms of Soviet power. Divorced from this wartime spirit, these criticisms would lose much of their vigour.

IV

Liberation of territories occupied by the Germans began in earnest from 1943 onwards. But relief and joy were for Grossman increasingly overshadowed by what he learned about life under German occupation. In "The Ukraine" ("Ukraina"; 1943) he records details of wanton destruction and vindictiveness which even those accustomed to over two years of war found shocking. The sheer scale was daunting:

Можно твердо сказать, что человечество не знало за всю свою историю преступлений такой жестокости, таких масштабов. Речь идет об огромных землях, о десятках и сотнях городов, о тысячах сел. Речь идет об организованной казни миллионов детей, стариков, женщин, пленных, раненых. Речь идет о рабстве великих народов.⁹⁸

The Jews fared still worse and it is their fate which marks another powerful quantifiable shift in Grossman's attitude towards the war, its meaning and interpretation. Apart from his work for Krasnaya zvezda Grossman also wrote for the Yiddish newspaper Einigkeit. One particular article, "Ukraina bez evreev", does to a certain degree parallel "Ukraina". But Grossman goes further. He draws attention to the striking absence of the Jews in the Ukraine after its liberation:

Где сотни тысяч евреев, стариков и детей? Куда девался миллион людей, которые три года назад мирно жили вместе с украинцами, жили и трудились на этой земле?...⁹⁹

Indirectly Grossman raises highly sensitive questions. How were the Germans, who were not indigenous to the Ukraine, able to round up, with such terrifying efficiency, so many millions of people? How did they know them? Among the unstated answers are willing collaboration, and more importantly Ukrainian anti-Semitism, which the Germans were able to exploit. These were matters that Grossman could only hint at,

and this probably explains why the sequel, announced for publication at the end of the first part, never followed. Ideological considerations may have played a role. Grossman's reportage of atrocities perpetrated against the Jews underlined the cultural legacy of Judaism, its intellectual vigour and the question of nationality. Such emphasis did not accord with Lenin's well known views that concepts of Jewish nationality and culture were harmful and reactionary

The fate of the Ukraine's Jews was of the profoundest importance for Grossman personally. On 15th September 1941 his mother, along with thousands of others, was murdered in the Berdichev ghetto. Grossman's account of the massacre, written after exhaustive research and interviews with survivors, has to the knowledge of this author, still not been published in the Soviet Union. Written for the Chernaya kniga, "The Murder of the Jews in Berdichev" ("Ubiystvo evreev v Berdicheve"; 1944-46) exposes collaboration, plundering of Jews who have been condemned to death, Red Army desertion, and examples of incredible bravery, particularly from children. Execution at this stage of the war was often by mass machine-gunning, the most horrendous example of which took place at Babi Yar near Kiev. A similar fate befell Berdichev's Jewish population and Grossman's painstaking and shocking reconstruction is without equal:

Весь день длилось это чудовищное избиение невинных и беспомощных, весь день лилась кровь. Ямы были полны крови, глинистая почва не впитывала ее, кровь выступала за края, огромными лужами стояла на земле, текла ручейками, скапливалась в низменных местах. Раненые, падая в ямы, гибли не от выстрелов эсэсовцев, а захлебываясь, тонули в крови, наполнявшей ямы. Сапоги палачей промокли от крови. Жертвы подходили к могиле по крови. Весь день безумные крики вновь и вновь убиваемых стояли в воздухе. Крестьяне окрестных хуторов бежали из своих домов, чтобы не слышать воплей страданий, которых не может выдержать человеческое сердце. Весь день люди, бесконечной колонной проходившие мимо места казни, видели своих матерей, детей уже стоящими на краю ямы, к которой судьба сулила им подойти через час или два. И весь день воздух оглашали слова прощания. 100

The murder of Berdichev's Jews was one of many such incidents, repeated throughout the Ukraine. Unable to satisfy Himmler's insatiable appetite for Jewish blood, it was the prelude to the gas chambers and ovens, manifestations - one might argue - of the true Dark Ages, which Grossman first covered in Treblinskiy ad.

Treblinskiy ad was published in 1944. It is a landmark in the wartime journalism of any of the Allied nations. For the first time a correspondent, known and respected in both West and East, confirmed the enormity of what had taken place, which while the outcome of the war was still undecided had not - perhaps understandably - commanded the attention it ought to have. Even allowing for the massive amount of research which has been devoted to the Holocaust, Grossman's coverage still deserves close scrutiny.

Firstly, he describes the mechanism of industrialised slaughter and the gigantic administrative task of collection, transportation, murder and disposal, along with all the savagery and cruelty that that implies. Secondly, he poses the questions of guilt and responsibility: was the Holocaust the sole consequence of Nazism, or does it have to be understood, if it can be understood ¹⁰¹, in a wider and deeper historical context? Finally, where does man go, where can he go, after such evil?

Grossman does not draw a distinction between the efficiency necessary for the implementation of the Holocaust and that required in ordinary administration and management, for which the Germans have become famous:

Бережливость, аккуратность, расчетливость, педантичная чистота - все это не плохие черты, ... Гитлеризм приложил эти черты к преступлению против человечества... словно речь шла о разведении цветной капусты или картофеля. ¹⁰²

Treblinka's efficiency is that of the industrial age; 'конвейерная плаха'. ¹⁰³

Having survived the ordeal of a long train journey, invariably without food or water, the victims, on arrival were subjected to repeated humiliations before being dispatched to the gas chamber. The family circle is broken up so as to weaken any potential resistance, possessions and hair are removed. Grossman highlights the strange dualism which characterises the Germans' method at this juncture.

Every effort was made to deceive the victims, yet for those who stepped out of line, literally in some cases, at this preliminary stage, punishment was swift and sadistic; then all pretence at secrecy was abandoned.

Treblinskiy ad is remarkable for the degree to which Grossman is able to penetrate the minds of the murderers and victims. The deception of new-arrivals is a good example. Only at the very last moment did many victims realise that something terrible was about to befall them. Nevertheless, new-arrivals felt instinctively ill at ease. Nagging questions remain unanswered:

Обостренный взор людей быстро ловил тревожащие мелочи - на торопливо подметенной, видимо за несколько минут до выхода партии земле видные были брошенные предметы... Как попали они сюда? И почему сразу же за вокзальной платформой... растет желтая трава и тянется трехметровая проволока?... и почему так странно усмеваются новые охранники...? 104

Grossman's portrayal of the SS guards reveals sheer disbelief as much as anger. He probes from various angles: are those responsible the product of unique socio-political conditions, or are they simply evil? There is, however, anger directed at those who have turned a blind eye to the evidence of the Final Solution. Indirectly, they have helped Hitler by their conspiracy of silence:

Надо бы, чтобы в эти ужасные минуты у здания « газовни » появились и римский папа, и мистер Брейлсфорд, и все другие гуманейшие заступники гитлеризма, появились бы, конечно, в качестве зрителей. 105

The undisguised animosity towards the Pope reflects more than just a bitter reproach concerning the Roman Catholic Church's failure - with some worthy exceptions - to stand up to Hitler. Roman Catholicism put the mark of Cain on the Jews with the claim that the Jews had committed the crime of deicide. In those parts of Eastern Europe where Catholicism was the prevailing religion this accusation was especially useful to the Nazis. Grossman addresses a far wider audience when he asks an SS guard: 'О Кайн, где те, кого ты сюда привез'? 106 The mark of Cain is borne by Hitlerism and its sympathisers, not the Jews.

Among the SS guards there exists an almost religious zeal with

regard to the prosecution of the Final Solution. They are not unthinking robots, carrying out another's will; they wholeheartedly accept the necessity for genocide. Hannah Arendt's suggestion, made at the time of the Eichmann trial, that those responsible for running the camps were mere automatons, that they epitomised 'the banality of evil'¹⁰⁷ is repudiated by Grossman. The elaborate deception measures were not only intended to obscure Germany's real aims from the victims themselves and the world at large, they were, too, an attempt by the executioners to fool themselves. Numerous euphemisms for killing, a fastidious concern for their own physical well-being and for regular leave back in Germany formed, as Grossman implies, part of a monstrous veneer of normality which surrounded mass murder.

In Treblinskiy ad Grossman unswervingly adheres to his belief that the duty of the writer is to tell the 'страшная правда'.¹⁰⁸ This he does uncompromisingly in all his reports connected with the Holocaust. To know and hear the truth becomes a moral obligation:

Всякий, кто отвернется, кто закроет глаза и пройдет мимо,
оскорбит память погибших. Всякий, кто не узнает всей правды
так никогда и не поймет, с каким врагом, с каким чудовищем
вступила в смертную борьбу наша великая, наша святая Красная
Армия.¹⁰⁹

This unswerving belief exerts an immense influence on Grossman's later writing. It serves as a moral imperative and intellectual stimulus. Compelled by what he has seen, Grossman can no longer divorce German and Soviet anti-Semitism from one another. Once this is conceded, other heresies ineluctably follow.

Grossman's final sketches, written in the closing months of the war, represent a summing up, a thanksgiving, an epilogue. Typical of this are "Moscow-Warsaw" (Moskva-Varshava; 1945, "'Between the Vistula and the Oder'" ("Mezhdu Visloy i Oderom"; 1945), "Germany" ("Germaniya; 1945"), "The Power of the Offensive" ("Sila nastupleniya"; 1945) and "On the Threshold of War and Peace" ("Na rubezhe voyny i mira; 1945). Of these the last is the most significant.

"Na rubezhe voyny i mira" was not published in either the 1946 or 1950 collections containing Grossman's wartime ocherki and rasskazy. There are a number of likely reasons for this. In the work Grossman unreservedly attributes the decisive role in the victory over Nazi

Germany to the Red Army, rather than the Party, a claim which since 1945 has been the subject of heated, but coded, debate. However, other themes, potentially still more hazardous for a writer were addressed by Grossman.

For example, Grossman recognizes the mass support enjoyed by Hitler at home. Official Soviet attitudes towards Hitler's rise to power have tended to ignore this. Until recently the view that Hitler seized power in 1933 was very widely propagated.¹¹⁰ The view that the Nazis seized power is necessary to sustain the myth of a valiant German Communist Party; that the KPD was a victim of the political extremism, endemic in the Weimar republic, rather than, together with the Nazis, a major cause of instability. Grossman acknowledges the genuine anger felt by many Germans towards the Nazis, here and elsewhere, but asks: were they so silent as they received the news of Germany's early military victories, and the imminent fall of Moscow?

As in Treblinskiy ad, Grossman sees the fate of European Jewry as unique in history, a consequence of Germany's invasion certainly, but one which overshadows all others. It is a crime which cannot be measured in numerical terms, but in the cold-bloodedness of its conception and execution. For Grossman, it follows inexorably that the essence of reparations must be moral, not economic:

Есть репарации более важные и значительные, чем материальные
возмещения: репарации моральные.¹¹¹

It is doubtful whether Stalin and his economic advisers were much concerned with Germany's moral rehabilitation. Grossman's compassion seems strangely at odds with the massive and totally justified resentment towards Germany. His diaries for this period demonstrate a remarkable sensitivity to the feelings of Germans and to the prevailing mood of profound and crushing despair which has overwhelmed them:

На скамейке раненый немецкий солдат обнимает девушку,
сестру милосердия. Они ни на кого не глядят. Мир для них
не существует. Когда спустя час, я прохожу снова мимо них,
они сидят в той же позе. Мир не существует, они
счастливы.¹¹²

One finds it difficult to determine whether Grossman reproaches or accepts the couple's right to be happy amid such devastation.

Clearly, the aggression visited on Europe by Germany has invited the latter's destruction. Nevertheless, the ensuing justice must be fair and not descend into mindless vindictiveness. After all, some Germans did resist Hitler. To make this point Grossman recalls his visit to a prison in Berlin, where a German Communist, Kluge, had been incarcerated for 12 years.

Equally controversial are Grossman's observations concerning the standard of living enjoyed by Germans, even after five years of war. Grossman recognizes the high level of entrepreneurial skill, the efficiently run and comfortable farms of East Prussia and the impressive system of autobahns. Recognition of these achievements confuted the wildly exaggerated claims made by the Soviet propaganda machine: German workers did not live in conditions of grinding poverty; and the Soviet standard of living was not as high as its apologists claimed.

Discrepancies of this kind posed an intractable conundrum for Soviet soldiers. Why did Germany with all her wealth and advanced infrastructure attack the Soviet Union? From the anecdotal evidence which Grossman cites, this was an important question for large numbers of Soviet soldiers in the occupation forces. Seeing the enemy heartland at first hand, the vast majority beyond the boundaries of the Soviet Union for the first time, they were clearly not going to be fobbed off by, 'всякая словесная формула'.¹¹³ In addition Grossman openly admits:

Здесь есть много такого, чему полезно поучиться нашему технику, инженеру, агроному, химику, устроителям коммунального благополучия.¹¹⁴

Here, Grossman abandons the propagandistic stance - unconvincing and unsuited to his talents - though one he had adopted in Narod bessmertn to persuade us of German shortcomings in industry and technology. With a candour not found in other writers of the period, Grossman concedes the inferior status of Soviet agriculture, engineering and construction. For a writer to impugn the commanding heights of Soviet socialism, at a time when the superiority of everything Soviet was being proclaimed ad nauseam, would do little to endear him to Soviet officialdom.

Had "Na rubezhe voyny i mira" been published during the

Zhdanovshchina, the consequences for Grossman, exacerbated by the hostile response to "Esli verit' pifagoreytasam", may well have proved fatal. With the spectre of annihilation vanquished, Grossman's tendency to speculate in sensitive areas, tolerated to an extent during the war, was no longer welcome. Inevitably, in the renewed climate of conformity, Grossman soon fell foul of the ideological machine.

Post-War Images of the Soviet Soldier.

Chapter IV

I

Conceived and begun towards the end of the war, Za pravoe delo represents the first serious attempt by a Soviet author to examine the various factors which determined victory. During Stalin's lifetime such an undertaking was fraught with risk even for writers with only a modicum of talent, and thus one to be avoided. For a writer such as Grossman, whose sense of duty towards the fallen did not abate in peacetime, this was especially the case. Nevertheless, it was an undertaking he felt compelled to complete, and one which he found intellectually irresistible. Given, therefore, the fact that the official interpretation of the war after 1945 marked . . . 'one of the most audacious efforts ever undertaken by the Soviet leadership to tailor history to political prescription' 1, the campaign against Grossman, which ensued after the publication of Za pravoe delo, was only to be expected.

Portraits of Soviet soldiers in Za pravoe delo are distinguished by the following characteristics: greater depth in presentation; more pronounced assertions of individuality, which while not necessarily at odds with all the aspirations of Soviet society, are nevertheless a challenge to its pervasive uniformity; a manifestly greater relevance attached to social and historical contexts; and a more explicit criticism of Soviet values. Petr Semenovitch Vavilov typifies this change in emphasis. A kolkhoznik, his transition from civilian to soldier and his eventual death at Stalingrad forms one of the most moving and convincing narrative strands in the novel. The influence of the Stalingrad sketches is obvious and the genesis of Vavilov owes much to Gromov, Vlasov and Chekhov in the Stalingrad sketches.

The differences between journal and book versions affect the manner in which Vavilov is introduced, and in turn influence our perception of the war. The journal version commences with news of Vavilov's conscription. As one of the older men in the village, he is one of the last to be called up. The mood is one of gloom. The book version opens with a meeting between Hitler and Mussolini. The Führer discusses his future plans with the Duce. His power and

strength are at their zenith. He seems invincible. Yet we detect a hint of desperation on Hitler's part. Initial military success has hidden from him the scale of potential resistance. The sudden shift from Hitler's headquarters to Vavilov's village in rural Russia is dramatic. It emphasises the human cost of Hitler's megalomania, and how his plans have torn a continent asunder. Yet Grossman creates the basis for some optimism. Hitler's strategy for the decisive phase of the war leads to Stalingrad. It is men like Vavilov, drawn from all over Russia, who will thwart it.

Behind Vavilov stand the undeniable achievements of Soviet industrialisation. Mechanisation has affected all levels of Soviet society. Education and literacy are within the grasp of all. Under threat from Hitler these gains must be defended. Yet there are discordant voices in Vavilov's village. Pukhov, an old man, remembers Tsarist times, and arguing with others, among them Vavilov, about the changes which have taken place since 1917, reserves his greatest anger for the the kolkhoz: 'а вообще все бы хорошо, только бы не колхозы'.² Vavilov's reply is not as innocent as it seems:

он считал, что больше народ помогает государству, тем больше сможет государство помочь народу.³

Mutual cooperation and trust have never formed the basis of the relationship between the Soviet government and people, especially among rural people. With collectivisation the most terrible pre-war memory of rural Russia, Vavilov's hopes seem strangely naive. But in the post-war context it makes the point that the debt is massively one-sided; it was the people who helped and saved the state, a state, which was arbitrary and ruthless in its treatment of its subjects, yet demanded total loyalty and uncomplaining sacrifice at the moment of greatest need.

The party chairman of Vavilov's kolkhoz undermines the idealised notion of cooperation between state and people still further. First and foremost he promotes his own interests, using the kolkhoz as a platform. Production figures are falsified, those who can be of use are assiduously sought after. Nepotism is rife. While Vavilov has been conscripted, the chairman has secured a safe factory job for his son. However, such behaviour draws attention to those qualities which Grossman values in Vavilov. Self-sacrifice, taciturnity and honesty

are in marked contrast to the selfish opportunism and dishonesty of the party chairman.

Another side to Vavilov emerges in an incident, which like Grossman's critical vignette of the party chairman was not included in the journal version of the novel. One evening before the war, Vavilov is disturbed by a knock on his door. He is confronted by an old, unshaven man, requesting shelter for the night. Vavilov's hospitality is spontaneous. Food, shelter and clothing are all provided. In the night the police go straight to the shed, where Vavilov lodges his guest. The stranger is arrested and Vavilov taken for interrogation. As he explains to the police, his motives were humanitarian: 'Пожалел... А чего спрашивать, я сам вижу- человек'.⁴ We learn nothing of the arrested man's fate. Police interest and his unkempt appearance suggest an escapee. In Stalin's Russia Vavilov's help could easily have been construed as something sinister. Many would have refused to help, regarding it as suicidal. Clearly, Vavilov is not easily intimidated. Shared humanity is more important than a man's politics, and whether amid the atmosphere of endemic suspicion in pre-war Russia, or facing Hitler, Vavilov is prepared to, stand up and be counted.

Vavilov quickly adapts to the demands of military life, joining a battalion which forms part of Rodimtsev's division. His moral qualities soon reveal themselves. Usurov, a soldier in Vavilov's company, demands payment from a homeless old woman, who wishes to occupy his trench. Usurov no longer needs the trench, since the unit has received the order to move out. His demand is simple extortion. Vavilov forces Usurov to return the payment, a shawl. For Usurov, war is an opportunity to abandon moral restraints and codes of behaviour, as indeed it is for many. This affronts Vavilov's sense of duty: the Army exists to serve the people, not to plunder them.

A second incident of greater importance for Vavilov the soldier takes place during a German air raid. Vavilov's company is surprised by enemy planes. Many are killed and wounded. An atmosphere of panic spreads, discipline begins to crumble. Vavilov's leadership comes to the fore. He persuades his comrades to seek cover where they are, rather than run helter skelter, increasing the likelihood of casualties. All are impressed by Vavilov's quick thinking and

fortitude in adversity. These two incidents mark a turning point in Vavilov's military career:

...Вавилов, и был тем человеком, вокруг которого самим собой завязались в роте внутренние духовные связи между людьми, связи объединявшие молодых и пожилых, разбронированных и и ветеранов. 5

Both incidents enhance his prestige among his fellow soldiers. Thus Vavilov's subsequent leadership and responsibility in battle are all the more credible. Well before the battle in Stalingrad we are given a rounded portrait of him. Among the less threatening aspects of Bubennov's invective directed at Grossman in 1953 was criticism of the motifs of 'обреченность и жертвенность' 6 in Vavilov's characterisation. Both motifs do indeed inform Grossman's image of Vavilov. His conscription suggests an end to all hopes for the future, as Vavilov repeatedly looks to the past. His life seems over: 'да, здесь шла его жизнь' 7 and the sense of a final reckoning is unmistakable: 'Вот, дочка, и мое время пришло'. 8 Particularly poignant in Vavilov's departure is the description of the oven in his hut, the focal point in any peasant's dwelling. Evoking companionship, comfort and earthy domesticity, it is a powerful symbol of Rus', enduring and timeless:

Печь, дымившая в серые мартовские дни, печь с обнажившимися из-под побелки кирпичом, с выпуклым от старости боком показалось ему славной, как живое, всю жизнь прожившее рядом существом. 9

Vavilov's final moments at home are some of the most memorable in the novel. Outward domestic calm and the quiet, unhurried preparations for departure are effectively contrasted with the inner turmoil of husband and wife and the presence of foreboding. Tasks, hitherto routine, assume a special significance. Chopping firewood and collecting water become activities to be savoured. They are reminders of contentment, familial stability and continuity, which have to be abandoned. Vavilov's lot is that of millions of others, the shared experience of all soldiers departing for the front, the pain of departure, 'которая не знает и не хочет ни утешения, ни понимания'. 10 To ignore this aspect of war, would be to ignore, what for many, was one of the worst aspects of the war experience. The point is

reinforced in an analogous incident.

Resting, exhausted after a long forced march, Vavilov and his comrades receive food and water from a woman who joins them on the roadside. Vavilov is struck by the woman's physical resemblance to his wife. Similarly, her house reminds him of home:

...таким родным, близким показались ему и запах и тепло, и
печь, и стол, и лавка у окна, и полати...11

Touched by her hospitality, he hews a door for her hut, (an obvious parallel with Vavilov's own departure from home). One particular parallel is absent. Vavilov learns that her husband was killed in the battles around Moscow in February 1942. We may see this as a portent of Vavilov's own death at Stalingrad. It completes the symmetry of these two scenes, part of a seemingly endless recurrence of personal tragedy, and confirms Vavilov's gloomy prediction made earlier: '...после войны девушек будет больше, чем женихов'.12

In Stalingrad Vavilov is shocked by the scenes of devastation which greet him. Seen through professional military eyes, rubble and ruins represent a tactical landscape with its own set of unique features to be surmounted. For Vavilov it represents the wanton destruction of peacetime work 'сокрушение величайшего труда'.13 With his own commitment to fruitful toil, he readily identifies his life and fate with that of the battered city:

Все это было связано с его жизнью, с постелью, на которой он
спал, с хлебом, который он косил, с его женой, детьми, с его
родной землей, с его любовью к труду, с его судьбой.14

This passage first appeared in the journal version. Inexplicably, it was not included in the book. Given the lack of emphasis which Vavilov attaches to ideological considerations, such a passage would have been more appropriate for the book and not the journal, since Grossman was repeatedly criticised for his failure to glorify Stalin and the Party. The presence of this passage is also difficult to reconcile with the view that Grossman:

...не показывает истоков массового героизма советских людей
их исполинской силы, их бессмертных подвигов, во имя родины,
во имя победы над врагом.15

The message is not difficult to decode. The critic's objection to Vavilov's motivation - and not solely his - is based on a long string

of phrases, which when used judiciously, arouse powerful emotions. However, debased by the Party's propaganda machine, ideas such as: 'mass heroism of the Soviet people'; 'immortal deeds'; 'giant strength'; and 'in the name of the Motherland', become empty clichés. In this context they are either synonyms or derivatives of Stalin's genius, to which Grossman fails to pay obeisance. At their face value the critic's objections hardly need to be taken seriously - a close examination of the circumstances of Vavilov's death will negate them.

During the fighting Vavilov's battalion is reduced to a handful of soldiers. Scattered groups fight on until they are overwhelmed. Among his group the task of leadership falls to Vavilov. Facing death, and conscious that personal differences are no longer important, the men pull closer together:

Само собой получалось, что бойцы стали оглядываться на него, а потом лениться к нему. Никто не таил сухарей в карманах и воды в балажках, когда он велел поделить их. 16

Vavilov and his comrades await their death with grim determination. A fleeting vision of home comes to him in his final minutes. He remembers that he had wanted to move the stove in his hut, a task for the summer, which has now passed. Family and home, the source of his moral resolve, are linked to his final moments. Vavilov's death is rich in symbols of light and darkness. He stands up from the 'густой мрак земли' 17 to throw a grenade and is illuminated by the oblique rays of the morning sun. Attracting enemy fire, he suffers fatal wounds, but death is made to wait. Calm and unhurried, his life ebbs away:

...а он все стоял в светло-желтом пыльном облаке, когда не стало его видно, казалось, он не рухнул мертвым кровавым комом, растворился в пыльной, молочно-желтой, клубящейся в лучах утреннего солнца туманности. 18

Life and light have triumphed over death and darkness. In the journal variant Vavilov's death is suffixed with the enigmatic statement and question:

Так кончилась эта битва стрелкового батальона на Волге.

Кто победил в ней? 19

Biblical connotations are suggested. The destruction of the battalion is what one might term Grossman's parable of courage and self-

sacrifice. Tactically, the Germans have won a victory, but the Soviet High Command has won time. In the long run this was to prove crucial.

Grossman's account has a sound factual basis. While in Stalingrad he acquired a report written by one of the commanders who perished in the battle for the station.²⁰ A report, written in similar circumstances, is mentioned in Za pravoe delo. Furthermore, Grossman manages to cast some light on an event referred to by Alexander Werth. According to eyewitness accounts, an entire division was wiped out in central Stalingrad in the middle of September.²¹ An almost identical incident - in this case involving a slightly smaller formation than a division - is referred to in "Napravlenie glavnogo udara". During a lull in the fighting a regiment advances a kilometre, an enormous distance by Stalingrad standards. Eventually it is overrun and annihilated. Of interest here is the fact that the end of Vavilov's battalion, the timing and manner, accords closely with the incident mentioned by Werth and Grossman in his wartime ocherk. The main difference lies in the scale of the disaster. Whether this was due to the censor, or conformed to artistic considerations, we do not know. But the overall effect suits Grossman's artistic purpose. Small groups of soldiers permit a far greater level of intimacy to be established between reader and character. Our sense of loss is more acute than would have been possible had Grossman concentrated on a bigger formation.

Soviet interpretations of Vavilov's death have generally been unfavourable, although two reviewers were positive. S. L'vov in Ogonyok, argued that the unit's fate marks the beginning of the 'бессмертная боевая традиция сталинградцев: ни шагу назад'.²² In marked contrast to the majority of assessments, he sees Vavilov as the epitome of 'непоколебимой народной стойкости' ²³, a view endorsed by B. Galanov in Molodoy kommunist.²⁴ A. Lektorskiy, whose article in Kommunist was one of the most hostile towards Grossman, contended that the 'эпизодический образ' ²⁵ of Vavilov did not lend itself to the portrayal of the peasantry. Bubenov praised the image of Vavilov, but suggested that Grossman had under-exposed the work's 'самый яркий, самый интересный герой'.²⁶ Both Lektorskiy and Bubenov seek an image of the peasant which is consistent with the requirements of socialist realism. In fact Bubenov goes so far as to say that

Vavilov, ... 'наиболее типичен для советской эпохи'.²⁷ In a work other than Za pravoe delo, Vavilov could easily have become the dominant character. Here, however, he is just one of many who pass before the reader. Tipichnost', if indeed, Grossman considered it all, demanded Vavilov's death, not his survival; particularly in the light of the High Command's order that troops resisted to death.

Several minor characters in Vavilov's unit merit consideration. Grossman stresses heterogeneity - another reason why notions of tipichnost' as understood in socialist realism cannot be applied. Some clearly find the burden of military life difficult to accept. Mulyarchuk is one such soldier:

Если обследовали на вшивость, то единственным показательным по вшивости оказывался Мулярчук: если случалась проверка обмундирования, то обязательно плохая заправка... у

Мулярчука. 28

His unsuitability for the more formal aspects of military life is contrasted with the efficiency and experience of Rys'ev, a professional soldier, who has served in the first battles of the war. Grossman's aim in accommodating these two contrasting types is not difficult to discern. No military unit consists entirely of outstanding soldiers such as Rys'ev, or the military drop-out type such as Mulyarchuk. Both types are to be found alongside others of average ability. Grossman's attempts to reflect the lack of uniformity, to highlight the idiosyncracies which exist in any military unit, earned him little credit. In a short article published in Zvezda and ostensibly written by a serving soldier, it was asserted that Mulyarchuk was, . . . 'какой-то запечный увалень, а не воин Советской Армии'.²⁹ Belonging to Vavilov's nucleus of survivors, Mulyarchuk fights and dies with great valour, his admirable moral qualities finally revealed at the moment of greatest need:

особо резко, казалось, изменился Мулярчук. Клевый и, как многим представлялось, бестолковый человек стал неузнаваем. Даже лицо его изменилось[...].

Дважды зажал его в окопе немецкий танк, дважды выполз он из окопа и с немыслимо короткого расстояния сокрушил врага фугасной противотанковой гранатой. 30

Dramatic changes can be noted in Usurov. Castigated by Vavilov for

his bullying behaviour, he forgets the past. Normally selfish, at last he puts the interests of his comrades before his own:

Усуров, готовый поскандалить по любому поводу, жадный до еды и до предметов, стал покладистым, щедрым, отдавал половину табаку и хлебный паек Рысьеву. 31

The heroism of Mulyarchuk and Usurov was unacceptable. It undermined preconceived ideas about the nature of the podvig. Grossman, it was contended, did not grasp the fact that, . . . 'не Мулярчуки и Усуровы, а люди, всей своей жизнью подготовленные к подвигу, встали с оружием в руках против фашистского агрессора'. 32 That ordinary people could suddenly and inexplicably find reserves of physical and moral courage in extremis was unwelcome. Spontaneous, unsolicited courage implied a deeper, more complex psychological explanation for heroism than Soviet critics were prepared to countenance.

Among the wider Soviet readership Grossman's portraits were warmly received. Letters addressed to Grossman in 1953 and published recently in Literaturnaya gazeta indicate just how strong the support was. Commenting on Grossman's characterization, one reader wrote:

Величие этих людей состоит в том, что войну они приняли как великое несчастье, встретили ее не только вздохами и охами а напрягают все отпущенные им природой физические и духовные силы, чтобы преодолеть это несчастье. Они не теряют своего величия от того, что их мысли часто заняты будничными заботами: о наградах, о сухом пайке, о том, что скоро зима и нет обуви, даже о любовной истории и т.п., так как без этих будничных забот и мыслей не бывает живых людей... 33

Penal troops or shtrafniki were extensively used in the war. Stalingrad was no exception. In the journal version of Za pravoe delo we are given to understand that these units comprise those soldiers who are guilty of minor breaches of military discipline. In the book, supplementary information shows - as Grossman's readers would have known - that political offenders served as well; those who have been sent to the front, 'взамен отбывтия лагерного срока'. 34 Common practice during the war, it says much about the state's attitude to its citizens.

Both journal and book versions fill in spaces which many would have

preferred left blank. Yakhontov, a member of Vavilov's unit, has a biography which is all too familiar. His parents die in the Civil War. Although dead, his parents were nonetheless class enemies - the father is described as a chinovnik - and in the thirties Yakhontov is arrested. Only at Stalingrad does Yakhontov find some relief from the memories of the past: the orphanage; the breakdown of his marriage; the descent into alcoholism; and the camps. In the face of extreme danger, he records exhilaration:

Никогда, пожалуй, за всю свою многосложную, пеструю жизнь не испытывал он такого счастья, как в этот миг. Сегодня дрался он не за себя, а за всех. 35

The journal version ends with the observation: 'Он чувствовал себя солдатом правды'. 36 His supreme loyalty to Russia repudiates the accusations made in the thirties that he and thousands like him, now in the Army, were enemies of the people. This is the truth for which he fights, and such a truth surely carries an implied counter-accusation that the Party is the real enemy of the people. Yakhontov's bravery represents a personal triumph. It justifies the unstinting approval of his company commander, who describes the shtrafniki as: 'герой один в один'. 37 Such bravery is precious and in this respect the root of Yakhontov's name, yakhont, which means ruby or sapphire, coheres with the aims of characterization. Yakhontov and his fellow shtrafniki are indeed precious stones among the rubble.

The experiences of Vavilov and his comrades permit qualification of comments first expressed by Grossman in "Vlasov". There Grossman argued that in war Russian soldiers do not undergo the profound changes commonly recorded by Western writers in the transition from peace to war. Vavilov's motivation and conduct would seem to confirm this view and Grossman's observation in Za pravoe delo that Vavilov in war, 'остался таким, каким он был' 38 is consistent with the continuity in Vlasov's behaviour. However, with regard to Mulyarchuk, Usurov and Yakhontov this is not the case. Persecuted before the war, they experience a profound change in their attitudes to Soviet power. These changes support the interpretation of Grossman's remarks, which was offered earlier. These men fought for their own freedom, for their own dignity, to achieve recognition of the injustices which they had suffered.

Self-discovery lies at the heart of youthful heroism, and in this respect Anatoliy Shaposhnikov is Grossman's most recognizably Tolstoyan hero. Circumstances surrounding Tolya's participation in war have much in common with Sergey's in Stepan Kol'chugin. Both come from a predominantly intellectual milieu, and fascination with war is as great as any sense of duty. Myopic and acutely conscious of his lack of physical prowess, Tolya seems singularly unsuited to the demands of war. This impression is reinforced by the frequency with which Grossman interweaves images of war and Tolya's home life. Mother and family impinge upon his military consciousness before an encounter with the Germans. The effect is to emphasise the tenderness of the mother-son relationship and contrast it with the brutality of war. Moreover, Tolya is prone to daydreams and fantasises about social success and sexual conquest. His adolescence and lack of social poise are a clear challenge to the established convention of the Soviet hero. Clearly, Grossman anticipates many of the themes addressed by Okudzhava in Bud' zdorov, shkolyar.

But the parallels cannot be taken too far. Whereas Okudzhava's schoolboy wanders seemingly aimlessly around the battlefield, Tolya confronts war with a sense of purpose. For him war is his 'главное жизненное испытание'.³⁹ War is an opportunity to know himself, 'вот если б себя знать'⁴⁰, the realization of his latent potential. Tolya surmounts the challenge. His battery occupies a forward position and represents a major obstacle to the German advance. Cut off, the battery is overwhelmed. Much younger than those whom he commands, Tolya demonstrates exemplary leadership until he is seriously wounded. The approach of death assumes mystical proportions. Symbols of light, redolent of Vavilov's death, create this effect, as Tolya watches the sunrise:

Оно поднялось над заволжской степью, над нежно-розовым,
пепельным и жемчужным волжским туманом.⁴¹

Having seen the rising sun, and received as it were a final blessing, Tolya collapses unconscious. Darkness follows light, but we detect no sense of futility, only fulfilment in the knowledge that duty to comrades and self has been done, and done with great aplomb. Anatoliy Shaposhnikov is a fitting tribute to the Soviet Union's lost generation.

II

Grossman is not content in Za pravoe delo to confine himself to the rank and file's contribution to victory. Without the tactical skill and long-term planning of the staff officers the Germans would only be contained, not defeated. Consistent with this military reality, Grossman has addressed the problem of how Soviet officers faced up to the immense threat posed by the Wehrmacht. Colonel Vitaliy Alekseevich Novikov represents the new type of officer who was beginning to emerge from the disastrous defeats of 1941-42. Introduced into the narrative when the fall of Stalingrad seems imminent, Novikov, like many of Grossman's soldiers, has bitter and painful memories of 22nd June 1941.

Looking back to the immediate period before the German invasion, Novikov recalls the sanguine newspaper reports and the absence of any alarm. Although he himself seems to have believed that the wave of German conquest which rolled so effortlessly across Western Europe and the Mediterranean would terminate in Africa. The question as to why the Germans should stop there is never raised. Moreover, even if they were to remain content with these conquests, such a situation would still constitute a grave threat to Soviet interests. Unlike some of his more sceptical colleagues, Novikov expresses his conviction that: 'война с Германией возможна не ранее, чем через 8-10 лет'.⁴² Novikov's remarks are wildly exaggerated. They emphasise two points. First, that there were those in the Soviet Army in 1941 who believed a German invasion was imminent. Second, to the slight detriment of Novikov's overall characterization, which one may plausibly argue amounts to a gambit on Grossman's part, they draw attention to the criminal negligence of those in the very highest circles, who failed to respond. This would indeed seem to be Grossman's aim, since later in the journal Novikov realises that the danger is much closer: 'Это оттяжка на год, на два!'⁴³

Considerable alarm is caused by the German airborne invasion of Crete. Novikov recalls attending a lecture in which it is analysed. One of the audience refers to the possible violation of the 'торговый договор'⁴⁴ in the near future, an obvious allusion to the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, which in addition to its infamous military protocols,

(now officially recognised in the Soviet Union) also included trade agreements. These trade agreements were fully implemented by the Soviet Union right up to the invasion. Having heard this report Novikov revises his opinions: 'если Россия избегнет военной грозы это будет чудо, да ведь чудес не бывает!'.⁴⁵ War now seems inevitable, and likely to break out much sooner than the 8-10 years - the period for which the pact was valid - earlier envisaged by Novikov.

References to German operations in Crete enable us to determine the exact period in question. Crete was finally overrun on the 27th May 1941. Thus the meeting attended by Novikov took place less than a month before the beginning of Barbarossa. Even Novikov's revised estimate of when war will break out seems inadequate in the face of this. His recollections reveal widespread uncertainty and a lack of decisiveness among Soviet Army officers. Impeded by the foreign policy of their government, Soviet officers were unable to plan for an eventuality which many clearly foresaw. Grossman suggests - and there is much in this - that initial German successes were in no small way due to the debilitating ambiguities and wishful thinking which were the consequences of the Non-Aggression Pact.

Many of Novikov's preconceptions on war are rudely shattered in the first days of the invasion. The commander of a tank brigade orders a withdrawal. His unit has been bypassed by the Germans. It makes no sense to remain. The withdrawal is orderly and there is no suggestion of panic or cowardice. Convinced that they will reach the Russian lines, Novikov later learns that the brigade was annihilated by German aircraft. This incident was not included in the book version. However tactically sound the withdrawal may have been, it cast the Army in an unfavourable light. Furthermore, it contradicts the general view that Army units when outnumbered and outflanked fought to the death. With regard to our understanding of Novikov, the omission is unfortunate. He approves the measures taken by the commander for the withdrawal, measures which failed to take cognizance of airpower in modern war. It should also be noted that the brigade commander is a veteran of the Civil and Russo-Finnish Wars, neither of which prepared Soviet commanders for the onslaught of the German Wehrmacht. Whereas the tank brigade was totally destroyed, an artillery unit, which Novikov had written off, survived, inflicting heavy losses on

the Germans. Aggressively led, Russian troops are capable of stopping the Germans. Shortcomings in experience and equipment are not the sole reasons for the string of defeats. The two contrasting incidents are important for Novikov's development as a professional officer. He too has much to learn.

War, as Novikov confesses to himself, is not quite what it seems: 'она не укладывалась в формулу, которую придумал в ту пору Новиков'.⁴⁶ The traumatic experience of the summer of 1941 is a vital element in Novikov's acquisition of command skills. It is the crucible in which the new officer is tempered. The message is reiterated in Zhizn' i sud'ba. Having played a vital role in the encirclement operation, Novikov, in conversation with Darenskiy, a fellow officer, acknowledges that: 'лето сорок первого года, казалось, закалило, ожесточило его навек'.⁴⁷ Nor is the importance of this period confined to Novikov alone. For many of Grossman's soldiers the memory of 1941 is haunting and enduring, second only perhaps to the euphoria of final victory. In "The Infantryman" ("Pekhotinets"; 1945) the trauma of 1941 and the joy of 1945 are indissolubly linked:

Кто не испытал всей горечи лета 1941 года, тот не может во всей глубине оценить счастье нашей победы.⁴⁸

By late 1942 Novikov has established himself as a highly competent staff officer, well versed in the intricacies of logistics and planning. Yet he is frustrated and seeks the opportunity to prove himself on the battlefield:

Он считал себя боевым командиром, прирожденным танкистом, чьи способности полностью проявятся в прямой схватке с врагом, натурой, склонной не только к логике и анализу, но и к быстрым волевым ударам, к решениям, в которых аналитические способности и точная разработка деталей дружат со страстью и риском.⁴⁹

In effect Grossman defines the qualities of the new Soviet officer, which will lead to victory. As this new type - the root of the name suggests new(novyy) - Novikov is more successful than Mertsalov in Narod bessmertn. He has the relevant experience of mobile operations and convincingly combines the necessary intellectual and personal qualities.

Offensive operations are his main interest. For example he wishes

to write a study of the Russo-Finnish war, specifically the penetration of the Mannerheim line. This war was an embarrassing shambles for the Russians. In breaching the Mannerheim line nearly a million men were used and large numbers of guns. Despite eventual success against a numerically inferior enemy, the offensive doctrine of the Soviet Army was found wanting. Novikov's study could not avoid such a conclusion. If the Russians were to match the Germans, the brilliant exponents of mobile warfare, the rapier would have to replace the unwieldy club. Had Grossman wished to make a more optimistic comment on Soviet military thinking and practice, he could have referred to the exploits of Zhukov against the Japanese at the Battle of Khalkin-Gol in May 1939.

Novikov's aspirations and approach to military matters bring him into conflict with his immediate superior, General Bykov. Bykov resents Novikov's independence of mind and self-assurance, yet relies on him for the efficient running of his headquarters. For this reason Novikov's repeated requests for a transfer to a more active role are blocked. The character of Bykov was not well received by the critics. His mental ponderosity - his name is particularly apt, its root is bull (byk) - and obvious envy of Novikov's abilities, as well as the attention he pays to his creature comforts, aroused anger. Bykov, it was argued, was not representative of the intermediate and higher levels of command. He and others of that ilk were not 'типичный'.⁵⁰ A. Lektorskiy concluded that all would have been well had Grossman contrasted the Bykov type with the, 'яркие, правдивые характеры генералов и офицеров Советской Армии'.⁵¹ This was tacit admission that such negative types existed and implicit rejection of Novikov's suitability to fill the more positive role.

In the later, book, version Grossman widens his attack on Bykov and the type of officer he represents. At a briefing for the front commander Bykov betrays his lack of familiarity with the men under his command. Asked for the name of an officer who has been killed in action, he cannot remember. Novikov can, demonstrating once again his grasp of detail, essential for efficient staff work. Addressing Bykov, Novikov and other officers, the front commander stresses the need for initiative in military operations. In addition he underlines the need for mobile rather than static defence. This is germane to

Novikov, since he has just completed a paper on the subject. Grossman identifies Novikov, therefore, with the future trend of Soviet planning. This entire chapter was added for the book version.⁵² Many failings are still evident among senior officers. Equally important, however, is the fact that the initiative for change originates from within the ranks of the Army, not at the behest of the Party.

Novikov's paper finds its way to Moscow. As a result he is charged with the formation and training of a tank corps. Specific details of Novikov's paper are not given. But his thoughts on military matters are sufficiently frequent that its main thrust is clear:

единственной реальностью войны было соотношение сил на
линии фронта в строго ограниченный отрезок времени.⁵³

This is the hard lesson of the German Blitzkrieg: the concentration of massive forces at specific points on the front in order to achieve a breakthrough, which is in turn exploited by mobile infantry and tanks. Anticipation of the Stalingrad scenario is obvious.

Information provided by Ortenberg⁵⁴ and supplemented by recently published extracts of Grossman's notebooks⁵⁵ would suggest that the figure of Novikov owes much to a wartime tank officer, A. Kh. Babadzhanyan. In 1945 Grossman wrote a series of articles for Krasnaya zvezda under the title "A Soviet Officer" ("Sovetskiy ofitser"; 1945).⁵⁶ The article was based on the experiences of Babadzhanyan, who after the war was to become the Soviet Union's most senior tank commander. In "Sovetskiy ofitser" Grossman offers a portrait of a single exemplary individual. With this in mind A. Bocharov has called the title 'типизирующий'.⁵⁷ As a highly successful officer and eventual Marshal of the Soviet Union, Babadzhanyan hardly typifies the average Soviet officer. Rather he represents the highest standards achieved by his particular arm of the Soviet Army, an example to other officers.

Experience and interests unite the image of Novikov with Babadzhanyan. Both are linked to the Russo-Finnish War: Babadzhanyan was wounded in it, and as we have seen Novikov wishes to write about it. Both have experienced the trauma of 1941. Indeed, Babadzhanyan appears in Narod bessmertn. In the autumn of 1941 while in the Ukraine, Grossman attempted to get through to the 395th Rifle Regiment. Unable to reach it because of fierce fighting, Grossman

learned, incorrectly, that its commander Major Babadzhanyan had been killed in battle. This detail forms the basis of an incident in Narod bessmertn. Only towards the end of the war did Grossman find out that Babadzhanyan had not after all been killed. Novikov's and Babadzhanyan's most important common denominator is their appreciation of mobile warfare. Both realise the need for interarm cooperation. Babadzhanyan underlines Novikov's views:

В конце 1941 года я видел, как чудесно сочетается
подвижная пехота с танками. 58

Similarly, the need for aggressive speed is paramount:

Только в страшной стремительности можно нарушить
оборону противника. 59

Novikov was a principal target for Soviet critics, which is ironic when one considers just how much common ground he has with one of the Soviet Union's most successful soldiers. Criticism tended to concentrate on two main areas. First, Novikov was incompatible with the requirement of tipichnost'. Bubenov contended that Novikov and other characters in Za pravoe delo were, 'безлики, бледны, неинтересны, принижены'. 60 Novikov, Lektorskiy argued, lacked verisimilitude, 'читатель не может поверить, что в образе полковника Новикова воплощены типические черты характера командо-начальствующего состава Советской Армии. 61 An analogous line was adopted by Yu. Morokhovskiy in Zvezda, who, in addition, accused Grossman of not understanding the, 'марксистско-ленинского учения о постоянно действующих факторах войны'. 62

Second, considerable resentment was expressed towards Novikov's paper. That a new concept of military operations should come from a colonel implied a lack of originality on the part of very senior officers. Lektorskiy's diatribe against Novikov was followed up by prolix and verbose praise of the Party and Stalin, whose organisational and guiding role 63 Grossman had omitted to depict. Bubenov went still further. How, he argued, could Novikov teach the Soviet High Command anything on mobile warfare, when, 'любому младшему командиру нашей армии известны эти азбучные истины военной науки'. 64 He reinforced his argument by a lengthy quotation from Za pravoe delo, which he claimed, vitiated any possibility of Novikov being a 'дальновидный офицер'. 65 The extract merits attention. Novikov is

questioned by General Federenko, the head of the armoured forces directorate, as to how he understands the preparation of the new armoured formations. Novikov replies that the emphasis will be on 'массированное применение танков в активной обороне'.⁶⁶ Federenko counters with 'массированное применение танков в наступлении'.⁶⁷ For Bubennov, Novikov's reply attests his unsuitability for a responsible command: 'После этого приходится только удивляться, как полковник Новиков получил высокое назначение'.⁶⁸ Novikov's answer is not as unusual or bereft of professionalism as Bubennov claims. Arriving in Moscow, Novikov enquires of a colleague as to the situation in Stalingrad. The news is depressing. Thousands have just died in a massive German air raid and armoured columns have penetrated into the industrial heartland of the city. Thus, Novikov's reply that massed tank formations should be used in active defence is a sound appreciation - to use military parlance - given the current situation on the battlefield. We should also bear in mind that being in Moscow he cannot have precise information of latest developments from the front. Furthermore, the new tank formations for which Novikov has been designated commander will form part of the Soviet counter-offensive. Federenko alludes to this in his reply. It is not a reproach, as Bubennov suggests, but a more accurate answer based on his knowledge of the High Command's future intentions. Novikov could not possibly be privy to such information. His credentials as a far-sighted, resourceful and energetic officer are, therefore, in no way undermined by his answer.

Novikov is not alone in his impatience and frustration with Bykov. Lt Colonel Darenskiy, a fellow staff officer, has been transferred from the front to a reserve unit because of a disagreement with Bykov over the Germans' future intentions. Inactive behind his own lines, Darenskiy finds little solace in the fact that his views were later vindicated. Darenskiy's great strength is, as Novikov tells him, 'нюх, интуиция хорошая'.⁶⁹ He instinctively grasps and understands what Bykov does not. Darenskiy's ability to anticipate the most likely course of a battle is not based on guess-work as Bykov contemptuously suggests, but on shrewd and intelligent deduction of known facts. Above all, he is a meticulous observer. He is, too, a harsh critic of those who seek to add gloss to Soviet disasters. In his notebook for

1941 he quotes a newspaper report on the German advance: « Сильно потрепанный враг продолжал трусливо наступать ». 70 This is indeed an, 'оригинальная формула' 71, and one which epitomised the attitude to unpleasant facts. Conditioned by the Terror to disregard and even fear the truth, commanders such as Bykov find Darenskiy's realism threatening. Now, more than ever, truth is needed; not just the need to face up to the true military situation, but personal honesty and integrity. Arrested in 1937, Darenskiy understands the seductive power of the lie.

The flaw in Novikov's military background resides in his dearth of command experience in the field. This stems partly from Grossman's attempt to create a well-rounded portrait of an officer. Had Novikov been a junior officer his transition to either staff work or command at the higher levels would have been difficult to accomplish in a satisfactory manner. Junior officers in the Soviet Army did not find themselves promoted to take charge of new formations. Similarly, the transition from staff work to a field command often signified punishment of some kind, invariably with loss of rank. As an established staff officer Novikov's promotion, based on experiences gained at the front is credible. To this end Grossman devotes considerable effort to persuade us of Novikov's competence. We do not doubt Novikov's bravery or the value of his combat experience. But his ability to lead a large formation, like the concept he has argued for, have yet to be fully tested. Novikov, like Darenskiy, typifies a breed of officer whose time has come.

III

Central to the aim of this chapter is an examination of the soldiers occupying house 6/1 in Zhizn' i sud'ba. Surrounded on all sides by the Germans, with access only possible at night through a covered communications trench, house 6/1 is a forward observation post well inside the German lines. We may view it as a microcosm of the Stalingrad defence, for it is the typical small unit which bore the brunt of the German offensive. Historically, the basis for house 6/1 is accurate. Scattered sub-units played a key role in the city's defence and its antecedents are recorded by Grossman in the

Stalingrad sketches. For example in "Tsaritsyn-Stalingrad" 72 he mentions the feat of Sergeant Pavlov whose section retained control of a square in central Stalingrad for 50 days. The house, crucial to the defence in that sector, became known as "Pavlov's House" ("Pavlovskiy dom"), and was referred to as such in official situation reports.

Located on one of the most probable axes for a German advance, house 6/1 is essential for correcting the Russian artillery fire. Moreover, as the divisional commander realises, the Germans in the prelude to an all-out assault will be obliged to destroy house 6/1 in order to weaken the effectiveness of the Russian artillery. It provides, therefore, a useful guide to German intentions. For this reason senior officers are quite prepared to sacrifice it and the men who occupy it when it is expedient to do so.

The soldiers inside house 6/1 are well aware of their position's significance to both sides. A fascinating mixture of raw recruits, eccentrics, ruthlessly efficient killers and heretics, their closeness to death liberates them from the inhibitions of Soviet society. Grekov, the surly, fiercely independent commander of house 6/1 is an outstanding Grossman creation. Personal example and natural leadership inspire loyalty and deep affection from his men. Serezhka Shaposhnikov in Zhizn' i sud'ba characterizes him as a combination of, 'силы, отваги, властности с житейской обыденностью'.⁷³ Grekov's hardness and refusal to yield to intimidation from any source stem from a sense of indestructible dignity and the belief in the rights of the individual to determine his own life. In this respect he has much in common with Yakhontov in Za pravoe delo, an affinity which is affirmed by their commitment to truth. Serezhka calls Grekov a 'бопец за правду'⁷⁴ which is redolent of Yakhontov's earlier self-appraisal. Grekov's aspirations are not unique. They are shared by many others; they are those of ordinary Russian people. To this end Grossman stresses Grekov's unremarkable life before the war:

В довоенной его жизни не было ничего примечательного, был он когда-то десятником в шахте, потом техником-строителем, стал пехотным капитаном, . . .вечером читал книжечки, пил водочку, ходил в кино...⁷⁵

Grekov resents interference from senior officers. Despite orders he refuses to send written reports and ignores his radio schedules.

Paperwork he regards as an unnecessary obstacle;

Бумажной ерундой мне некогда заниматься, мы отчитываемся
только перед фрицами. 76

Grekov's style of leadership is not appreciated by the political officers at headquarters, one of whom refers to Grekov's section as 'какая-то Парижская коммуна'.⁷⁷ Grekov is viewed with deep suspicion and hostility. His refusal to kowtow to the Party, or indeed anything else, and his determination to be his own man usurp the key role envisaged for the political commissar. Confrontation is inevitable.

On a more personal level Grekov inspires envy. A genuine spirit of equality exists among Grekov and his men. Based on mutual respect and shared dangers, it serves to highlight the inadequacy of ideology. Only this can explain why Serezhka wishes to return to the dangers of house 6/1, abandoning the relative comfort and security of headquarters (we are reminded here of Sergey in Stepan Kol'chugin). Within the context of the novel his return is profoundly symbolic. House 6/1 represents suppressed Russia, caught between Hitler and Stalin, an outpost of freedom in no man's land. This atmosphere of freedom is noted by Katya, the new signaller. She is struck by the self-confidence and moral vigour of the occupants. For her, as for Serezhka, house 6/1 gives her a new perspective from which to view her life before the war.

Given what we have seen in house 6/1, Bocharov's observation is somewhat unusual:

... в « Жизни и судьбе » нет ни запальчивой апологии
« окопной правды », ни намеренной полемики с « армейским
НП », автор выше этих навязанных нашей литературе никчемных
споров. 78

Grekov's attitude and behaviour alone are sufficient to refute this view. Nor is it reasonable to suggest that the tension between headquarters and those in the front line is somehow contrived. Soviet war literature abounds in such examples. However, okopnaya pravda embraces profounder contradictions and they are manifest in Zhizn' i sud'ba.

We see some of these in the activities of the scout, Vasya Klimov, another occupant of house 6/1. The scouts or razvedchiki are a

frontline élite whom even Grekov respects. Their hallmarks are independence, daring and a consummate skill in killing. To date, Klimov has already killed 110 Germans. Unlike the snipers who kill at a distance, Klimov kills at close quarters, having penetrated deep inside the German lines. Klimov possesses remarkable self-control, a chilling detachment. On one foray behind the German lines Klimov and Shaposhnikov have crawled so close to an enemy trench that Shaposhnikov is able to hear the stubble being removed as one of the Germans shaves. Klimov kills the occupants with two grenades, having waited for a suitable opportunity. The incident takes no more than a few seconds, but its impact on the reader, seen through the eyes of Shaposhnikov, is retarded by the details given before and after the killing. One is struck by its very ordinariness. The two Germans are killed while eating and shaving and Klimov, climbing into the trench, sneezes violently from the dust and residual gases. Killing, like eating or shaving, is just another human activity.

Yet with Klimov things are not quite what they seem. Having handed over the documents and accoutrements of the Germans, he asks Shaposhnikov to pour water over his hands. A sense of guilt is implied; its foundation would appear to be religion. Klimov never swears and Polyakov, his closest comrade, speculates as to whether Klimov is a baptist. For Klimov the act of killing causes moral anguish. Unconditionally proscribed in the Decalogue, killing is in the present circumstances an act of duty, the commandment of war. There is no alternative if the Germans are to be stopped. Klimov's dilemma is not unlike that of Chekhov the sniper.

Contradictions between religious and military duty are graphically underlined in a later scene. Klimov and Polyakov are caught in the middle of a massive German artillery bombardment. Forced to take cover in a shell hole, Klimov finds himself sharing it with a German soldier. Normal divisions of friend and foe temporarily break down as both shelter from the shell fire. Klimov, so confident in his response to the unexpected on the battlefield, is shocked into inaction:

. . . Он растерялся, его поразило, что, оглушенный и ослепленный, он утешался, чувствуя немца рядом, что руку немца он спутал с поляковской рукой. Они смотрели друг на

друга. Обоих придавила одна и та же сила, оба они были беспомощным бороться с этой силой и казалась, она не защищала одного из них, а одинаково угрожала и одному и другому. . . Они молчали, два военных жителя. Совершенный и безошибочный автоматизм - убить, - которым оба они обладали, - не сработал. 79

United in their desire to survive, the two enemies find their common humanity. That the killing mechanism should fail when it appears to be most needed is incomprehensible. Grossman, far from rejecting the ethos of okopnaya pravda with all its inherent conflicts and paradoxes, recognizes and literally endorses the conclusions of other writers. This scene has an obvious affinity with that referred to in Im Westen nichts Neues. Whether it is a direct borrowing, or whether it reflects an actual incident is less certain. Given that hundreds of thousands of Russian and German soldiers fought in such a small area at Stalingrad, the likelihood of such an encounter is not implausible.⁸⁰ There is one key difference between the two authors. Remarque's soldier kills the French interloper, whereas Klimov and the German survive and go their separate ways. In view of what we know of Klimov, Grossman's incident is less predictable, more problematic, but no less satisfactory in its understanding of the soldier at war.

IV

Analysis of soldiers in Zhizn' i sud'ba would be incomplete without further discussion of the snipers. Their psychology and motivation obviously fascinate Grossman, who in Zhizn' i sud'ba returns to some of the questions briefly raised in "Glazami Chekhova". The portraits are altogether more absorbing, yet far more disturbing.

Batyuk, a divisional commander, organises a meeting of the snipers who operate in his divisional area at the foot of Mamaev kurgan. The area is criss-crossed with ravines and gullies, an ideal killing zone for the primeval contest played out by the snipers of both sides. Nothing visibly distinguishes these soldiers from others. Zaytsev, the most successful sniper at Stalingrad, looks like an ordinary peasant lad, Khalimov, a young Uzbek, has the childlike habit of pouting his lips and Matsegura is married with children. Yet all have

shown themselves to be remarkably adept at long range execution. The discussion between Batyuk and his men is prosaic in tone. The snipers are completely hardened to killing, far more so than Klimov:

Это было производственное совещание, такое же, какое собиралось на заводах, в полевых станах. Но не ткачи, не пекари, не портные сидели здесь, не о хлебе и молотье говорили люди. 81

Although killing Germans is consistent with the aims of the war, they kill for additional reasons: inter-group rivalry; and even for the pleasure which it brings. In this respect the snipers' anecdotes are especially revealing.

Bulatov recalls an episode in which he killed a German soldier accompanied by a woman. He forces them to take cover, whereupon he allows them to stand up. Having done this three times, he finally kills the German:

А убил я его, когда он над ней стоял, так крест-на-крест и полегли на дороге. 82

The root of Bulat's name suggests sword (bulat) and thus he appears like Chekhov to be the agent of retribution. Yet as an explanation for what has occurred this is inadequate. Bulatov kills not from military necessity, but rather to gratify a psychopathic urge. The details of his story, recounted with such relish, expose something dark and sinister, . . . 'рассказ его был ужасен тем ужасом, которого никогда бывает в рассказах солдат'. 83 Very few soldiers kill in cold blood. Most kill when emotions run high, when under the intense stress of fear, anger and hatred. Emotions cloud the sniper's judgement. Sniping requires a much greater degree of control. The sniper stalks his prey, able to choose the time and place of the kill. In a very real sense he is the big game hunter of the battlefield; enemy soldiers are his trophies. With undisguised pride Bulatov tells his audience that his score to date is 78 Germans.

Duels between snipers were a common occurrence during the Battle of Stalingrad, and Zaytsev's account of his competition ('состязание' 84) with a top German sniper is the most famous. Grossman does not name the German involved, but from Zaytsev's own account 85 and numerous articles, we know that it was a Major Könings. The duel has become well established in the legend of the Stalingrad battle. Angry at the

success of Zaytsev, who by the time of the final surrender had killed some 300 enemy soldiers, the German High Command sent for the chief instructor at the Army's sniper school. Little separates both men in cunning and marksmanship. All Könings's attempts to lure Zaytsev into a trap fail. It is a supreme test of patience. Finally, the German breaks cover and stands up; so does the Russian. Zaytsev, recounting the episode in Batyuk's bunker, undergoes a marked change at this juncture in the narrative. Nothing of the mild-mannered peasant lad remains:

что-то могучее, львиное, зловещее было в этих раздувшихся ноздрах, в широком лбе, в глазах, полных ужасного, победного вдохновения. 86

Now standing and facing one another across the expanse of no man's land, Zaytsev and Könings, bring this episode to a macabre climax. Könings makes no attempt to escape, to take cover, or even shoot his adversary. As Zaytsev recalls: 'Он понял - узнал меня. И я выстрелил. 87 Zaytsev's greatest moment is the recognition given to him by the German. One professional has triumphed over another. Zaytsev's claim to be the supreme master of his art 88 is vindicated. Grossman's account differs from other published versions, including Zaytsev's. In Zaytsev's version the German betrays his position and is shot. Yet there is no face to face confrontation in the manner described by Grossman. Whether Grossman departs from the facts, or whether Zaytsev was forced to omit certain details, remains an open question. Zaytsev distances himself from his opponent, whereas in Grossman the two men belong to one another in a way which is more compatible with ancient notions of a warrior caste.

Attitudes among the snipers towards killing pose awkward questions for Krymov, a political commissar who attends the meeting. Blinded by ideology, he is concerned that ordinary workers are being killed alongside fascists. For Zaytsev and the others such considerations are irrelevant and Krymov forgoes the opportunity to make his point, conscious of its weakness: 'Эти мысли ведь не были нужны для войны, они не вооружали, а разоружали'. 89 Krymov's humanity lacks conviction. Horrified by the ruthlessness of the snipers, Krymov has no compunction about killing enemies of the revolution, many of whom are defined by what they might do, unlike the Germans. Nor does Krymov

appreciate the instinct of revenge. Khalimov's comrade Gurov was killed by the Germans; Solodkiy has been wounded three times; and Tokarev has lost a son. Stalking Germans was, among other things, an opportunity to even scores. The sniper's tally was as Zaytsev put it: 'личный счет мести фашистам'. 90

Bocharov is not alone in ignoring this theme in Grossman. On Grossman's depiction of the individual at war V. Kulish has written:

Война для него - не игра в героизм, не сфера красивых подвигов, а суровая необходимость, в которой человек, оставаясь человеком, защищает свои интересы. 91

With many of Grossman's characters this is undoubtedly the case; what we would regard as humane impulses are retained. Darenskiy's personal intervention to protect German prisoners of war from a savage beating after they have surrendered is an excellent example. Applied to Zaytsev and Bulatov there are difficulties. Kulish's observation is based on the assumption that man in war does not lose his humanity. The problem is whether the heart of man in war is represented more by Darenskiy, or more disturbingly by the likes of Bulatov. The very existence of war seems to suggest that the Bulatov type predominates. In this respect Kulish's choice of words is unwittingly informative. Man in war does indeed remain man, since his aggressive impulses and innate tendency to kill, suppressed in peacetime, are actively encouraged.

Soldiers and Commissars: Army and Party in Conflict

Chapter V

I

Conflict between soldiers and commissars is a sensitive theme in Soviet war literature and one whose existence is either vehemently denied, or portrayed in such a way as to suggest that it is localised and therefore of no real significance. However, the frequency with which this theme is present or implied does not support these views and any study of Soviet war literature needs to examine this relationship. Commissars are some of Grossman's earliest literary creations. They are key figures in the Civil War stories, "V gorode Berdicheve", "Chetyre dnya" and "Spring" (Vesna; 1935). Considered alongside the commissars in Grossman's later prose, they present a rich source of material for analysis.

There are a number of reasons as to why such an analysis is important. Firstly, Grossman demonstrates that the relationship between commissar and soldier - and not only the soldier -, is at best tense and inherently fragile. At times it is openly antagonistic. Secondly, since the commissars are closely associated with ideological orthodoxy, a study of their portrayal, methods and interaction with others, permits one to make some accurate deductions as to Grossman's attitude to the commissar, and thus ultimately orthodoxy itself. Thirdly, although they would claim to serve the same aims, one detects an unusual degree of heterogeneity among what might at first sight appear to be a dull and uninteresting group. Outlook, intellectual integrity, moral values and aspirations are seen to undergo a marked change as we follow Grossman's portrayal of the commissars from the Civil War to the Great Fatherland War. To a large extent this reflects the rise of Stalin and the process whereby those who saw themselves as the guardians of the revolution's heritage were cut down. Under Stalin, ruthless pragmatism, with him as its supreme exponent, was more highly valued than revolutionary fervour. Finally, the commissar theme in Grossman is of historical interest. It tells us about some of the profound changes which have shaped the Red Army since its creation.

The office of military commissar was readopted during the turbulent

period of the Civil War.¹ Forced to rely on former Tsarist officers, many of whom were openly hostile, the Party used the commissar as its arm in the field to override any decisions which were felt to be detrimental to its interests. One recent study claims that desertion of units under the command of ex-Tsarist officers was frequent enough, . . . 'to create a deep-seated and long-lasting Bolshevik mistrust of the professional military'.² Discussion over the role of the military commissar, his powers, obligations and even his necessity continued well after the Civil War was won. The military specialists, having proved their loyalty, believed dual control to be an unwelcome impediment to future effective command. Not surprisingly, the commissars, with Stalin prominent among them, had no wish to relinquish what they deemed an indispensable mechanism for averting the likelihood of treachery, or indeed any Bonapartist ambitions on the part of the more charismatic officers.

Opposition to the system of political commissars was conducted with varying degrees of determination and vociferousness between 1921 and 1925. The system was openly opposed at the Tenth Party Congress in 1921, culminating in the Circular 200, allegedly written and disseminated by Antonov-Ovseenko, head of the Political Directorate of the Red Army. Up to 1925 there existed some possibility that the voice of opposition might prevail. However, with Trotsky's removal from the post of Commissar for War, and Stalin's growing power, firm political control became well established. At various times after 1925 the institution of the commissar was alternatively removed and reinstated. These swings in policy were largely determined by the Party's sense of its own insecurity and the need to create a modern and efficient army. The most ominous development in this cyclical process occurred in 1937. The system of commissars was reintroduced in June shortly before Tukhachevskiy's fall. The reasons for Stalin's decapitation of the Red Army have been thoroughly examined elsewhere³, but one conclusion seems irrefutable:

The fact that Stalin was willing to destroy his High Command and thousands of middle level commanders at the very moment of a rising danger of war in Europe bears out the earlier assertion that, in the last analysis, the Party rulers placed the retention of political hegemony in the state

ahead of other objectives. 4

The effects of such action hardly need stressing. Comradeship, morale and discipline without which no modern army, however well equipped can function, were gravely undermined. As Voroshilov told Stalin in 1938:

No one dares to trust his fellow, either superior or subordinates. I hear the same is true in the navy. Both forces are demoralised. 5

In the aftermath of the Finnish débâcle in the winter of 1939 the commissars were removed from the Army. In a desperate bid to restore some level of professional competence, military considerations were accorded priority over political ones. Unity of command (edinonachalie) was restored. It helped to foster a sense of professional autonomy among the military. But this was illusory, since it was the Party and not the Army who decided the status of the commissars in the Armed Forces.

II

Commissars were bearers of the new ideology as well as its loyal bodyguards. Their presence alongside the non-committed in Grossman's Civil War stories creates certain parallels and evolves into an examination of both revolutionary and bourgeois values. Set in the Russo-Polish War, "V gorode Berdicheve" depicts the fate of a female commissar, Klavdiya Vavilova, who is left in the safe keeping of a Jewish family to give birth. For Grossman, as well as for Soviet literature, the female commissar marked a new literary type. Written without the 'ангажированного романтизма тех лет' 6, the story was popular among the perevaltsy.

Nevertheless, Vavilova's occupation evokes a sense of unease among some of her fellows. To Kozyrev, one of her comrades, Vavilova's womanhood appears distorted, even debased. He observes: 'вроде и не баба,... и даже голос у нее не бабий'. 7 Pregnancy represents the reassertion of nature, 'природа свое берет'. 8 Vavilova's reaction to her pregnancy is one of hostility and anger, and she would welcome a miscarriage:

Она боролась с ним честно, упорно, и много месяцев: тяжело

пригала с лошади, молчаливая, яростная, на субботниках в городах ворочала многопудовые сосновые плахи. 9

Grossman specifically contrasts Vavilova, the battle hardened commissar with Beyla, her Jewish hostess, who is wise in the ways of birth and motherhood. Metaphors of war and struggle characterize the final moments of pregnancy and the preparations for the child's delivery. Half-conscious, Vavilova imagines the midwife to be a superior commander at the front. Attention to medical detail suggests the planning of a major battle. Victory itself is realised in the birth of the child. The battle won, Vavilova is reminded of the father, a sacrifice in another war:

она вспомнила того, молчаливого, и ей стало жаль их обоих острой материнской болью. Впервые она плакала о том убитом в бою под Коростелем. Он никогда не увидит своего сына. 10

The new-born child creates a conflict of duty between motherhood and Vavilova's formal obligations. The Red Army has been forced to retreat. Berdichev is threatened with occupation by the Polish Army. Should she stay and nurture the infant, or depart with the Red Army? Normally resourceful, Vavilova is reduced to indecision: 'Первый раз в жизни она не знала, что делать, как поступить'. 11 A group of students marching off to do battle with the Poles and singing revolutionary songs ends her indecision. The song reminds her of a rally in Moscow two years previously. Abandoning her child, she joins the students, almost certainly to die.

Interpretation of the denouement is not as clear cut as is perhaps suggested. Vavilova's commitment to the cause impresses the host, Magazanik. As she marches away, he castigates himself: 'А мы разве люди? Мы навоз'. 12 To a certain extent his admiration is understandable, but his self-judgement is too harsh. He and his family have shown great kindness and hospitality, and the child, another's, will remain with them. Furthermore, duty is not exclusively concerned with the Revolution. Heroism embraces more quotidian aspects of the human condition. Family life and the trials of parenthood are less glamorous, but no less worthy of admiration. Hence, one reason why the metaphor of struggle extends to childbirth and the exigencies of survival; these too are a podvig. Despite his appreciation of Vavilova's sense of duty, Magazanik realises that

soldiers, whether Russian or Polish, mean problems for those not immediately involved with the fighting. Commenting on the vacuum created by the departure of the Red Army, he tells Vavilova:

Сказать вам правду, говорил Магазаник, так это самое лучшее время для людей: одна власть ушла, другая не пришла. Ни тебе реквизиций, ни тебе контрибуций, ни тебе погромов. 13

In 1962 the Soviet director A. Askol'dov adapted Grossman's story for the cinema. Entitled Komissar, the screen version narrowly escaped destruction, despite the fact that only a brief reference was made to the disgraced author. 14 The film survived and was finally shown at the Berlin Film Festival in 1988. Bocharov's interpretation of the film's title in relation to that of the story is not entirely satisfactory:

Название рассказа и название фильма как раз и обнажали оба полюса художественной мысли автора: сила самозабвенного порыва революционеров и глубинные гуманистические ценности народа, выводимого революцией из политической, социальной, национальной « оседлости ». 15

Magazanik is a great deal less enthusiastic than Bocharov, aware that revolutions in fact threaten the 'humanitarian values of the people'. Moreover, it is by no means clear that Magazanik and his family are as parochial as Bocharov suggests.

Two convincing reasons for the film's delayed debut have been adduced by I. Murav'eva. Firstly, there is the Jewish theme which is sympathetically presented by Grossman and which drew attention to the plight of Soviet Jews. To quote Murav'eva:

..., что в годы, когда выезд евреев из СССР был столь рискованным и драматическим шагом, объявить еврейскую проблему как одну из самых актуальных и человеческих, значило, конечно, совершить настоящий поступок. 16

Secondly, there is the question of Magazanik's ambivalence towards the Revolution. His apprehensions towards any kind of military authority supports the view that:

Фильм вообще против всяких распрей между людьми, ибо все они принадлежат к механизмам, не только убивающим теплую человеческую жизнь, но и глубоко разъедающим и взрослую, и детскую психику. . . 17

Grossman's "Chetyre dnya" invites speculation as to whether it owes anything to Garshin's story of the same name. Obvious similarities are difficult to find. Garshin's story is set in the Russo-Turkish War. It depicts the mental and physical agonies suffered by a Russian, who for four days lies beside the putrefying corpse of an enemy soldier. Over this period he considers his culpability in the carnage of war. In Grossman's work three commissars are forced to hide in the rooms of a doctor. One of their number has been wounded and the arrival of the Polish Army is imminent. During this period of enforced inactivity and recuperation certain issues are raised. It is a period of reflection, and in this respect there is indeed a parallel with Garshin.

Both the doctor and his wife question the value of the Revolution:

Почему во время революции, которая якобы сделана для
счастья людей, в первую очередь страдают дети, старики,
беспомощные и ни в чем не виноватые люди?¹⁸

The commissars are silent.¹⁹ Unanswered, the question looms large throughout "Chetyre dnya", its urgency reinforced by the brutality of the Polish Army.

Of the three commissars Faktorovich is the most important for the evolution of this theme in Grossman's later prose. He is a fanatical believer in the justness of the Revolution, relentless in his prosecution of the class war. Disregarding the doctor's hospitality, he calls him a 'паршивый меньшевик'.²⁰ Cruelty and fanaticism dominate his character. Denouncing all doctors as enemies of the revolution, he demands their execution. Faktorovich is no caricature: he is deadly serious and during this bout of invective, his appearance becomes particularly intimidating and sinister. These are no idle threats:

Я бы их всех!... - крикнул он, и его тонкие губы искривились
и задрожали, а худое лицо было похоже на белый занесенный
нож.²¹

Faktorovich's maniacal obsession with class, his unbridled hatred of the bourgeoisie, attests profound psychological distortion. It is no coincidence that it matches the revulsion which he feels towards his own wasted body. Hatred of the class enemy stems from ferocious self-loathing as much as from any ideological conviction. Unsullied

by people and especially his own physical imperfections, ideology holds out the hope of purity. Contemptuous of his weak frame, Faktorovich refuses to heed the pain it suffers. Death from self-immolation or the bullet holds no fear:

Не колеблясь взошел бы он на костер, повернулся бы чухлой
грудью к винтовочным дулам. 22

A step towards the realisation of his ideal, it too would be an act of revenge on his body. This partially explains Faktorovich's extreme ruthlessness. Indifferent towards his own suffering and ready to submit his faith to the ultimate test, he can find no mercy for the enemies of the revolution whom he regards as a plague ('запаза' 23).

Class enmity is central to "The Dream" ("Mechta"; 1935). Interest for the present discussion centres on the relationship between Volynskiy, a newly appointed Red Army commander (komandir), and Sobeshchanskiy, a former Tsarist officer, and now the divisional commander's adjutant. Volynskiy's path to command and responsibility is typical of many. A former ensign in the Tsarist Army, he has benefited from the post of komandir, which was created specifically to give non-commissioned ranks the opportunity to command at a higher level. It was a shrewd move which satisfied military and political expediency. Grateful for this opening, the ex-non-commissioned officers kept a watchful eye on erstwhile Tsarist officers.

Sobeshchanskiy appears shallow and cynical. Kiev, the focal point of Volynskiy's dream - that of the title - and which he hopes to liberate from the Whites, is important to Sobeshchanskiy for less exalted reasons. Kiev was where he first became infected with gonorrhoea. Sobeshchanskiy is flippant, cultivating the pose of an effete dandy. Yet this is an irritating veneer, which bears no resemblance to his impeccable performance in battle. Volynskiy grudgingly recognises this:

Собещанский внушал Вольнскому отвращение, хотя он знал, что
адъютант, имевший восемь ранений, немного ненормален, знал и
то, что Собещанский две недели тому назад в бою под
Жмеринкой, будучи ранен, не ушел в госпиталь, пока не
свалился с лошади. 24

The commitment of Sobeshchanskiy to a cause which is clearly implacably opposed to the ethos of his earlier army training and

experience touches upon the question of military loyalty. Sobeshchanskiy's bravery is beyond dispute, and in all probability he manifested the same bravery in the service of the Tsar. But the fact that he is able to serve two different masters would suggest that his loyalty is to something less obvious than either the autocracy or the Revolution. Ultimately, Sobeshchanskiy's loyalty is to the profession of arms, to a tradition of service for its own sake, rather than to his masters. The words of Von Seeckt are pertinent:

The form changes but the spirit remains as of old. It is
the spirit of selfless devotion to duty.²⁵

Not unaware perhaps of this ideal of abstract duty, the Party found yet another reason to ensure that the commissar became, 'the alter-ego of the commander'.²⁶

III

On the 16th July 1941 the system of commissars was once again reintroduced, indicating, ' . . . that the officer corps needed a touch of the Party whip'.²⁷ The prominence of Bogarev in Narod bessmertn reflects this renewed emphasis. A party zealot and ruthless martinet, Bogarev has all the sternness normally associated with the hero of a socialist realist work. In this respect he is well qualified to implement the Party's directive to commissars, which was promulgated at this crucial stage of the war. The commissars were obliged, . . . 'to wage a relentless struggle with cowards, the creators of panic and deserters'.²⁸ However, Bogarev is not exclusively concerned with discipline. He is also an ubiquitous commentator on strategy and war, whose credentials as a former professor of Marxism-Leninism are meant to give added weight to his judgements. One is given to understand that Bogarev's analyses and solutions are definitive, that they are based on a solid foundation.

Confronted with soldiers who have experienced only headlong retreat, Bogarev addresses himself to the question of morale. He attacks the myth of German military genius. Intellectually, he claims, it is weak:

В их способности механически подчиняться, бездумно
маршировать, в сложном и огромном движении скованных

дисциплиной миллионов солдатских масс было нечто неизменное, не свойственное свободному разуму человека. Эта была не культура разума, а цивилизация инстинктов, нечто идущее от организованности муравьев и стадных животных. 29

Bogarev's invective has important conclusions for the Soviet Army. The qualities which he attacks in the German military machine - discipline, cohesion, good communications and control - are the hallmarks of a modern army. They are noticeably absent from the Soviet Army. Moreover, if the corollary of greater military professionalism is dehumanisation of an army's soldiers, this must also apply to the Soviet Army. Ideology is used to bolster his arguments. German successes are transient, argues Bogarev, because their philosophical heritage is inferior:

Законы исторического движения в начатой ими войне не
познаны и не могут быть познаны ими. 30

Bogarev overlooks several points. The alleged inevitability and purported Soviet bias of the 'laws of historical movement' are irrelevant in the light of the German advance. In addition, as events later showed the Red Army failed to learn a number of lessons in the summer of 1941, particularly in the coordinated use of tanks and infantry. Failure to adapt had disastrous consequences a year later.

In chapter 6 the conflict between ideology and military realism is laid bare. A flanking attack is being considered. During the preparations the planning officers put forward their views on the German army. Myshanskiy admires the Germans: 'Всю стратегию и тактику перевернули'. 31 German airborne and motorcycle units have made a deep impression on him. He freely admits to having retreated with some eagerness in the early days after the war had begun. Myshanskiy's assessment of German abilities, which is certainly not rejected by other officers, incurs Bogarev's wrath and he launches into a lengthy tirade:

Вы должны научиться презирать фашизм. Вы должны понять, что это самое низшее, самое подлое, самое реакционное что есть на земле... сия гнусная идеология абсолютно лишена творческого элемента... Вся военная доктрина фашизма целиком и полностью списана из старых планов германского штаба, разработанных Шлиффеном... Танки и десанты, которыми фашисты

удивили мир, украдены: танки - у англичан, десанты у нас. Я постоянно изумляюсь чудовищной творческой бесплодности фашизма. Ни одного нового военного приема! Все списано... Германская творческая мысль во всех областях стерилизована: Фашисты бессильны изобретать... как военный комиссар части я запрещаю вам произносить слова, не достойные патриота и не отвечающие объективной правде. 32

Bogarev's intemperate language and racist hyperbole only serve to highlight the many flaws and inconsistencies in his arguments. While it may be desirable from the point of view of propaganda and agitation to despise the philosophical plinth of Fascism - such as it is - to ignore the potential of German military might is unforgivable. To do so is criminally negligent. For Myshanskiy and his fellow officers, such wilful ignorance is completely at odds with their professional training. Bogarev's preconceptions hamper the officers in the same way in which the Soviet government, anaesthetized by the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, refused to heed the signs of disaster: warnings from Western intelligence agencies; information from their own agents; and even German defectors.

Myshanskiy is not alone in his appreciation of German skills. The divisional chief of staff, in marked contrast to Bogarev's ideological bias in questions of strategy, exemplifies the professionalism of the regular officer based on a profound understanding of military thought:

...начальник штаба, профессор Академии, обладал всеми достоинствами ученого военного, знатока тактических приемов и стратегических решений. Начальник штаба был богат опытом военно-исторической науки и любил находить черты сходства и различия в операциях, которые проводили армии, с другими сражениями XX и XIX веков. Он обладал умом живым и не склонным к догме. Он высоко оценивал способность германского генералитета к маневру, подвижность фашистской пехоты... 33

Large scale military operations require more than good planning to achieve success. Boldness and a high degree of operational flexibility are as equally as important. The Germans possess both as Grossman makes clear.

A. Derman does not endorse Bogarev's attacks on Myshanskiy:

...отнюдь не военно-техническая, профессиональная, а
характерно-штатская концепция войны. 34

Myshanskiy does not praise Fascism. He acknowledges the organisation of the German military and the excellence of its General Staff. For a philosopher Bogarev's language lacks precision. He gives credit to the old German (germanskiy) general staff, while condemning the 'monstrous creative infertility of Fascism', only in similar language to condemn the poverty of German creative thought. That the concepts of tanks and airborne troops originated in Britain and the Soviet Union respectively does not impute a dearth of flexibility to the Germans. On the contrary they were quick to realise the potential of these concepts and brought them to a level way beyond that envisaged by their originators.

Derman takes issue with Bogarev on these points too. He cites a whole list of German military inventions, from pocket battleships to significant progress in the race to acquire the atomic bomb as evidence for the power of German ingenuity. Neither does he accept the distinction in aspirations between the Hitler era, and those of pre-Hitlerite Germany, which Bogarev, obsessed with ideology, seems to ignore:

Можно ли сомневаться в том, что духовным предком военного фашизма гитлеровской формации был Мольтке? Что духовным предком государственно-го фашизма гитлеровской поры был Бисмарк? Что духовным предком фашистской историографии был Трейчке? Что духовным предком гитлеровской философии был Ницше и Освальд Шпенглер? 35

As Derman implies, it is more a question of Fascism's monstrous fertility rather than its inherent sterility.

Doctrinal rigidity does not damage Bogarev's verisimilitude, but his pretensions to military expertise do. They appear to be based on very little. Can we accept that a commissar, who until only quite recently was a civilian, could have achieved this level of proficiency in such a short space of time? And if so, from where? Grossman provides no details, which might convince us of Bogarev's competence and experience, and therefore his suitability, to pass judgement on the professional military. This flaw has not gone unnoticed by V. Pertsov:

Разве не кажется в таком случае чудом то профессиональное понимание особенностей военного дела, то уверенное суждение о практических недостатках в организации боя, которое высказывает Богарев?36

Given the fact that Bogarev is a former professor of Marxism-Leninism one would expect him to possess an intimate knowledge of Marx and Engels on war. Nevertheless, in itself this is insufficient qualification. It stems from theory, too much of which has been discredited. With some justification Pertsov contends that Bogarev is 'бесплотный' 37, suggesting that this accounts for Ignat'ev's icon simile in his description of Bogarev. 38

None of these shortcomings has deterred A. Bocharov from making the following claim:

Своей постоянно и напряженной работой мысли, своим широким профессиональным опытом обобщения исторических явлений Богарев помогает автору извлекать « прямые » уроки из происходившего. 39

A similar view was expressed by A. Myasnikov shortly after the publication of Narod bessmertn: 'Профессор Богарев помог комиссару Богареву стать опытным воином'. 40 The extent to which Grossman uses Bogarev as the medium for his own views - to help him 'bring out the "direct" lessons of war' - is a moot point. Bogarev has very little to say on German military achievements against Britain and France, campaigns which held lessons for the Red Army. Similarly, with the Red Army in full retreat, Bogarev is hardly necessary to expound on the impending catastrophe. It is self-evident. Of far greater concern was how it came about, and most important of all, how to halt the Germans. Bogarev is inconsistent too. He ridicules the Germans' obsession with arithmetical detail 41, while later, having seriously undermined Myshanskiy's confidence, asserts that:

В этой битве народов мало знать арифметику войны: чтобы лупить врага, надо знать высшую математику. 42

Conflicting Soviet interpretations of Bogarev's role and value and the lacunae in his experience and knowledge raise the question as to what Grossman's position is towards Bogarev. Bocharov and Myasnikov have identified Grossman with Bogarev in a positive manner; Bogarev is a successful strategist and mentor. Derman on the other hand has

concluded that the flaws which we find in Bogarev's assessment of German intentions and his general disregard of the German threat are a consequence of Grossman's hatred of Fascism, which has, . . . 'воспрепятствовала ему углубиться в анализ'.⁴³ As a result of this, he adds, Grossman has simplified and underestimated the threat. One could certainly agree that Bogarev underestimates the forces ranged against Russia, but this is hardly true of Grossman.

Central to this question is Bogarev's relationship with Ignat'ev. In the battle to break out of encirclement both men are wounded:

Оттуда, где догорало пламя, шли два человека. Все знали их. Это были комиссар Богарев и красноармеец Игнатьев. Кровь текла по их одежде. Они шли, поддерживая один другого, тяжело и медленно ступая.⁴⁴

This symbolic affinity, insists Bocharov, is, . . . 'растворенный в атмосфере всей повести'.⁴⁵ Indeed, this is the case. At face value it suggests the inseparable unity of Party and people. However, another construction is also possible.

Ignat'ev's bravery and determination are beyond reproach, but his reaction to the war is emotional and instinctive. Intellectually, even more so than Mertsalov's, Bogarev's relationship with Ignat'ev lacks conviction. In this respect Bogarev is much closer to officers such as the divisional chief of staff. That Grossman stresses Bogarev's affinity with Ignat'ev, a peasant lad with no idea of strategy or logistics implies that Bogarev's ideas on such are as equally primitive. Given his rank and status, he constitutes a grave liability for the professional officer, trying to combat the German menace and interference from party zealots at the same time. Moreover, Bogarev undermines the relationship between officer and soldier. Dual command meant that the soldier was expected to serve two masters, both of whom proceed from markedly different interpretations as to how the war should be prosecuted. The results are no surprise. As Erickson has pointed out, it leads to, ' . . . that same chronic state of conflict and divided interests which was the natural concomitant of dual command'.⁴⁶ The figure of Bogarev testifies to the existence of this conflict, but he is also a major cause of it. Both his function and method are intrinsically combative. What we know of him provides very little support for

Alexander Werth's perception of the commissar:

In practice in 1941, the commissars proved, in the great majority of cases, to be either men who almost fully supported the officers, or were at most, a minor technical nuisance. 47

With regard to Cherednichenko's benign influence, Werth's comments do indeed appear reasonable. However, specific literary allusions are important. Cherednichenko remarks on his love of Garshin:

Я люблю, знаешь, Гаршина, вот правдиво сказал про солдатскую жизнь. 48

Garshin's appeal is unusual. His stories are grim accounts of war, which is portrayed as sordid and very uninspiring. Concepts such as podvig, rodina and otechestvo, so prominent in Soviet war literature, above all in the period 1941-45, are viewed with extreme scepticism. Garshin may be seen as the continuation of the Tolstoyan tradition of truth in war, and a definite precursor to what in the Soviet era has become known as Remarquism with all its various shades. Garshin's war prose poses further problems for Soviet ideology. To quote Peter Henry:

The fact that Soviet scholars never refer to Garshin's pacifism (or that of any other 'progressive' anti-war writer) has an ideological base in Lenin's pronouncements on 'just' and 'unjust' wars. 49

Given these considerations it is rather strange that a commissar should express such approval of Garshin, even more so when he is clearly at odds with Lenin.

Finally, if Garshin writes the truth about war, where is this truth in Narod bessmertn? We encounter none of the despair and pessimism which characterise Garshin's stories. With some justification Pertsov argues that the central theme of Narod bessmertn is 'возмездие'. 50 Yet retribution is only one aspect of the war. Its appeal is obvious. It is clearly defined; the message is easily grasped. An allusion to Garshin may be seen as a clue from Grossman that while he fully accepts the need to destroy the Germans, he has, too, not lost sight of the fact that not all the issues raised by the war lend themselves to such an apparently unequivocal solution. Indirectly, therefore, Grossman challenges the interpretation of the war offered by

Cherednichenko and Bogarev. Whether from an individual perspective or from that of professional military realism, too much emphasis is attached to ideology and propaganda.

IV

Revolutionary fanaticism, self-sacrifice and intellectualism, the distinguishing features of Faktorovich, Vavilova and Bogarev respectively, constitute three key strands in the characterization of commissar Nikolay Krymov. His association with other important characters in both Za pravoe delo and Zhizn' i sud'ba justifies the observation that he is a 'сквозной репой'.⁵¹ For our present theme he is of considerable importance.

Krymov is a member of the Old Guard, a veteran of the Civil War. He has also seen service in China and taken an active role in the Comintern. His personal life reflects this total commitment to the cause of the Revolution and Internationalism. Harshly ascetic and impervious to the more banal problems of everyday existence, Krymov inhabits a world of theory. He appears admirably qualified for the role of commissar. Yet even before his arrest in Zhizn' i sud'ba we are conscious that all is not well. To quote Lipkin:

И как ни ортодоксален Крымов, нас, читателей, что-то в нем тревожит, и на протяжении всего большого романа нас не покидает тяжелое предчувствие.⁵²

Several clues in Za pravoe delo support Lipkin's contention. Krymov's marriage to Zhenya Shaposhnikov has broken down. The revolutionary fervour, the romanticism generated by his involvement in the Civil War, no longer holds any attraction. Krymov's ruthlessness, such an integral feature of the Bolshevik method, alienates her. She recalls attending an address given by Krymov to mark the anniversary of the Revolution:

...и когда его спокойный голос повышался и кулак, поднятый точно молот, опускался вниз, по огромному залу проходил ветерок волнения, Женя чувствовала, что у нее холодеют кончики пальцев.⁵³

Problems are not confined to his domestic life. Gradually he is being dropped by colleagues: 'Ему перестали присылать приглашения в

Малый и Художественный театры'.⁵⁴ More ominously, he is sharply criticised at Party meetings, accused of having stagnated, of not having grown. Prescient of his fate, and moreover a sharp, symbolic rebuttal to his Internationalism, is the scene witnessed by Krymov and a group of foreign communists in Moscow zoo. Various animals are at play. The idyll is interrupted by a dingo's ferocious attack on a fox cub, which is easily construed as the rapacity of Hitler's Germany. Later, during the war, Zhenya remembers the visit. Associations, other than Hitler's Germany come to mind:

Где они, эти люди, тогдашние знакомые Крымова, где они в эти дни, когда страшная битва идет на русских полях и в русских степях? Кто из них жив, кто погиб в битве? Кто изменил? ⁵⁵

The war offers Krymov the chance to forget his domestic difficulties and to recapture some of the excitement of the Civil War. Bored by editorial work, he volunteers for the front:

Ему подумалась, что он запер в доме свое одиночество, освободился от него, и чем ближе поезд подходил к фронту, тем спокойней и уверенней он чувствовал себя. ⁵⁶

Krymov's journey to the front, through a countryside devastated by war, is depicted in some detail by Grossman. (Much of this detail is absent from the journal version ⁵⁷). The situation is much worse than Krymov had been led to believe:

В Москве Крымов предполагал, что бои идут где-то в районе Житомира; там, где, в 1920 году он был ранен в бою с бело-поляками. Оказалось, что немцы - под самым Киевом, ... ⁵⁸

Apart from the inferences we can draw about the reliability of Soviet military communiqués, this passage tells us that Krymov is not fully trusted.

No sooner has Krymov arrived at the front than he is retreating eastwards with the Army. Deletions and supplements pertaining to Krymov's breakout of encirclement would suggest that the incident is being played down. All references to the time factor - for Krymov's group this is 40 days - are removed.⁵⁹ Others are designed to create a spirit of unity among those who are clearly dispirited. One suspects that here we have an attempt to play down the calamitous retreat of 1941, since in Narod bessmertn problems of encirclement and breakout are important dramatic elements in the narrative. To

understand the shift in emphasis we need to take cognizance of the changes in official attitudes.

Narod bessmerten was written and published at a time when the Germans were carrying all before them. Any event which demonstrated resilience and particularly loyalty in the face of adversity was of immediate value. Thus, in the late summer of 1941, the breakout of Bogarev's detachment could be hailed as a great podvig. It deflected attention from battles lost. Contemporaneous 60 with that in Narod bessmerten, Krymov's breakout from encirclement in Za pravoe delo is described more realistically. The situation at the front is much worse. Optimism seems out of place. Hinted at in Narod bessmerten, these details are explicit in Za pravoe delo, tacit acknowledgement perhaps on Grossman's part of the role played by propaganda in Narod bessmerten. After the war officialdom was prepared to admit that the situation was bad - and to give its own reasons as to why it was - but not that bad.

Criticism of Za pravoe delo was not favourable to Krymov. According to Lektorskiy, Krymov the commissar was presented to the reader, 'в искаженном виде'.⁶¹ Nor were the more intimate details of Krymov's life, essential for any well-rounded character, appreciated. Krymov appeared as flawed, that is he, too, had distinctly human problems. He was unsuitable to be cast in the role of positive hero:

Крымов - человек ущербный, неудачник в личной жизни.

Незадолго перед началом войны его, оказывается, разлюбила жена, и эта личная трагедия отодвинула в сознании Крымова на второй план великие военные испытания народа.⁶²

In fact Krymov's personal problems are one reason why he wishes to escape the routine of Moscow. War brings an end to the loneliness. Krymov's motivation is not entirely ideological. One wonders whether he would have gone to the front, had Zhenya remained with him.

Nor was Krymov's experience in the Party put to good use either. Krymov was shown, . . . 'в отрыве от своей непосредственной работе руководителя и воспитателя масс'.⁶³ This is an unusual remark, since on one particular occasion, Krymov's leadership saves a critical situation. Surrounded in a forest by the Germans, the men with Krymov want to break up into small groups so as to avoid detection. Krymov's reaction is precisely what one would expect from a commissar. He

addresses the troops:

Сила наша в том, чтобы быть вместе: главная цель немцев разъединить нас. Сталин третьего июля звал к великому единству всех нас... Мы не оторванная частица, забытая в лесу, в тылу фашистов... клянусь вам партией Ленина-Сталина, мы пробьемся! 64

Lektorskiy's remarks are even more puzzling when one considers that the above extract was taken from the journal variant. Specific reference is made to Stalin's first speech of the war and the Party of Lenin and Stalin is invoked.

Bubennov, too, has tended to ignore Krymov's escapades in the rear of the German army too. Neither does he find Krymov's transfer to the political directorate at Stalingrad convincing:

В самой последней главе романа Николай Крымов отправляется в горящий Сталинград читать лекции. И здесь читатель невольно вспоминается, что Крымов именно с этого и начал свою « боевую жизнь » на войне... Неужели все начинается с начала? 65

Bubennov's comments obscure basic facts of which he must have been well aware. He ridicules Krymov's lectures, which were, and still are, a major function of the commissar. On arrival at the front Krymov is specifically tasked to give talks to the troops (для чтения докладов 66). Pouring scorn on Krymov, as Bubennov does, is misplaced. Grossman refuses to embellish the role of the commissar. Add to this Krymov's participation in the inherently tainted enterprise of escaping German encirclement and it is not difficult to understand why he should incur the displeasure of Bubennov and Lektorskiy. In his assessment of Mostovskoy, a veteran Bolshevik, and one whose biography has certain features in common with Krymov's, Lipkin provides another reason. Lipkin suggests that the image of Mostovskoy as a highly educated and respected figure constitutes a deliberate challenge to Stalin. 67 The same could easily be said of Krymov.

Several long supplements in the book version seem to indicate that Grossman had absorbed and responded to the criticism of Lektorskiy et al. Repeatedly, Krymov is asked advice by soldiers and his guiding role is enhanced. Yet the changes between the book and journal

versions are qualified. Those on whom Krymov makes the biggest impression are very young. Former factory workers and collective farmers, they are no match for the intellectual sophistication of Krymov. The pattern is a familiar one, it is redolent of the relationship between Bogarev and Ignat'ev. In other respects, it is more convincing. Unlike Bogarev, Krymov has seen active service, and he is no newcomer to war. His standing among the troops is credible. Many of the questions put to Krymov reflect a naivety and an ignorance of the world at large on the part of those asking them, but underlying others is a hard-headed realism. For example: will bread and books be free when communism is reached? A loaded question, it remains unanswered. But it is one of many pointers as to what we can expect in Zhizn' i sud'ba. Among Grekov's men in 6/1 Krymov finds men impatient for answers and quick to provide their own.

Grossman's attitude towards Krymov in Za pravoe delo is by no means clearly defined. Krymov never loses his faith in ideology. He convinces himself that the unity which he sees is essentially Soviet inspired, that the war is a continuation of the communist struggle against capitalism. Yet Krymov perceives cracks in his faith:

Он видел и понимал, что мучившие его противоречия не выдуманы им, а бушуют в обезумевшем мире. И он, стиснув губы, повторил про себя ленинские слова о том, что учение Маркса непобедимо потому, что оно верно. 68

The fallacy of circulus in demonstrando is not difficult to discern in Lenin's words. Moreover, if the teaching of Marx is 'true', why are there contradictions? More importantly, why does Krymov not resolve them rather than repeat what amounts to a hypnotic doxology?

Contradictions to the notion of Soviet unity (советское единство 69) confront Krymov during the retreat towards Stalingrad. Taking shelter in a peasant's hut, Krymov encounters profound hostility to Soviet power, particularly to collectivisation:

В тридцатом году народ у нас две недели пил, всех свиней порезали, двое с ума посходили. 70

The old man is as equally scathing of industrialisation:

А от нынешней жизни, от всех этих тракторов да комбайнов, ... добра нет. 71

Krymov's reaction is unusual. A firm rebuttal is called for, but is

not forthcoming. If Krymov merits criticism anywhere in Za pravoe delo it is here, since blatant anti-Soviet views remain unchallenged.

Krymov's invocation of Lenin and Marx and his reluctance to refute the old man, whom his driver bluntly refers to as 'заклятый кулак' 72, may be seen in the context of Krymov's visit to Yasnaya polyana. He is clearly moved:

и все как бы слилось: то, что происходит сейчас, сегодня,
и то, что описано Толстым в книге с такой силой и правдой,
что стало высшей реальностью прошедшей сто тридцать лет
назад войны. 73

The extract bears a close resemblance to an entry in Grossman's wartime notebooks. 74 In connection with Krymov, Grossman has made some significant changes. He refers to the 'force and truth' of Tolstoy's book, which have become the 'highest reality'. It is not Marx, Lenin or Stalin to whom Krymov must turn for guidance as to what is important as the war reaches Stalingrad, but to Tolstoy. Russian, not Soviet, unity, is the key to the defeat of the Germans. Receptive to Tolstoy - a positive sign in Grossman's eyes - Krymov is nevertheless forced into a crisis of belief. Internationalism has lost its potency. In the chaos of retreat resolution of the crisis may be deferred. However, amid the defenders at Stalingrad Krymov cannot sidestep the issues.

Increasingly, the educative and propagandist role of the commissar is becoming superfluous. The severity of the situation at Stalingrad is apparent to all. Grossman describes the mood of those involved:

И в эти дни без помощи агитаторов народ, стоявший у пушек,
тащивший на себя противотанковые ружья и пулеметы, и народ,
работавший на заводах, на полях, все увидели простую истину:
война дошла до Волги, за Волгой начинались степи Казахстана.
Эта истина, как все истины великого значения, была
необычайно проста и понятна всем без исключения. 75

Grossman's 'without the help of agitators', absent from the journal version is a curt retort - even perhaps a piece of overt defiance - to those who asserted that he had failed to show Krymov as 'воспитатель бойцов и офицеров'. 76

V

Education of the soldiers and officers included leadership under duress. Without a doubt, firmness and example were essential to morale. Krymov's qualities of leadership are well established. Yet the realisation by the Russian soldier in late 1942 of just how disastrous the situation was had further implications for the commissar. Soldiers drew upon their own physical and moral resources: they knew what had to be done and did it. It should be noted that Narod bessmertn is the only text of Grossman's wartime prose in which a commissar occupies such a visibly, but artificially, superior role. The absence of a commissar figure in the Stalingrad sketches and subsequent wartime works is a telling omission.

Soldiers who had stood firm acquired a new confidence in themselves. To a large extent this explains the indifference and even hostility which attend Krymov in Zhizn' i sud'ba. Krymov is no longer accorded the respect and prestige among the fighting troops to which he has grown accustomed. Indeed, the roles are reversed: he must now prove himself. Doubts and contradictions, adumbrated in Za pravoe delo, reveal themselves in uncompromising clarity in Zhizn' i sud'ba. Yet, Krymov continues to adhere to his ideological vision of the war, even though it is undermined from all quarters.

Changing attitudes towards Krymov among the Stalingradtsy manifest themselves very early in the narrative of Zhizn' i sud'ba. His internationalist clichés find little support. Used to retaining the initiative, to being in control, he feels manipulated. He is conscious that his work is irrelevant:

Он с каждым днем все больше сомневался, нужны ли его доклады. Иногда ему казалось, что слушают его из вежливости, как неверующие слушают старика священника. Правда, приходу его бывали рады, но он понимал, рады ему по-человечески, а не по его речам. 77

As he realises, . . . 'даже здесь в Сталинграде нет ему настоящего, боевого дела'. 78

Krymov's confidence in himself is restored when he is ordered to go to house 6/1 to re-establish 'большевистский порядок'. 79 He sees this task as reaffirming the Party's trust in him. Given the highly

vulnerable situation of Grekov and his men - an all-out German assault is imminent - one is tempted to conclude that Krymov's superiors hope to rid themselves of both him and the recalcitrant Grekov. For Krymov the signs are ominous. Crawling through the rubble, he notices the corpse of a Russian soldier. Though accustomed to seeing death, he is unusually shaken on this occasion:

Почему-то теперь, когда душа Крымова была полна живой надежды, ликовала, вид этого тела поразил его. Он много видел мертвецов, стал к ним безразличен. А сейчас он содрогнулся, тело, полное вечной смерти. 80

He is left with the feeling that he 'приближается к плахе'. 81

From the moment he arrives in house 6/1 Krymov's belief in his own superiority is constantly undermined. His jokes and observations are matched by firm and sharp ripostes, and his attempts to patronise the troops come to nothing. Calling to Grekov, who is intently scrutinising the German lines, Krymov attracts censure:

Когда Крымов окликнул его, он неохотно повернул лицо и лукаво, предостерегающе приложил палец к губам, снова взялся за бинокль. 82

Grekov's relaxed, almost contemptuous admonishment of Krymov reflects his self-confidence and personal authority. He is more than a match for Krymov. In replying to Krymov's questions Grekov is insolent. He resents the attempt to reimpose the rule book. As he points out:

Когда поселок отрезали, и я в этом доме собрал людей, оружие, отбил тридцать атак, восемь танков сжег, надо мной командиров не было. 83

Grossman demonstrates a masterful understanding of the soldier's abrasive and black sense of humour. Asked by Krymov where the female signaller is, Grekov replies with biting sarcasm:

Девушка эта - немецкая шпионка, она меня завербовала, а потом я ее изнасиловал, а потом я ее пристрелил, - вытянув шею, он спросил: - такого что ли ответа вам от меня нужно? - И с насмешкой сказал - я вижу, дело штрафным батальоном пахнет, так что ли, товарищ начальник. 84

Grekov's use of 'nachal'nik', instead of commissar, is analogous to the use of the same word by the anti-Bolshevik peasant whom Krymov meets in Za pravoe delo. 85 It expresses contempt, highlighting the

differences which separate the people from Party functionaries.

For Krymov the word 'nachal'nik', with the implication that he neither knows nor cares about the soldier's lot, is wounding and ironic. Krymov is no ordinary commissar. He is no stranger to danger and hardship. However, it is not a lack of bravery or fortitude which alienates him from the soldiers, but rather the ends to which such qualities are put. Krymov's exploits are not unimpressive. However, were he to recount them to Grekov's men, it would be seen as a sign of weakness:

А Крымов пришел в этот дом проявить свою силу, а не слабость. Он ведь не был политическим чиновником, он был военным комиссаром. 86

Insolence and brazen confidence are by no means confined to Grekov. Krymov's asserts that, 'русские прусских всегда били'. 87 The reply is laconic, but highly informative:

И в этом « точно » было столько снисходительной насмешки над общими формулами, что дружный негромкий смех прошел среди сидевших. Они знали не меньше человека, впервые сказавшего « русские прусских всегда били », о том, какую силу таят в себе русские, да они, собственно, и были самым выражением этой силы. Но они знали и понимали, что прусские дошли до Волги и Сталинграда вовсе не потому, что русские их всегда били. 88

Other soldiers are facetious. One suggests that Krymov has only come for the soup. While Polyakov, taking up a similar question to that put to Krymov in Za pravoe delo, asks with apparent seriousness, that if in a state of communism all will receive according to their need, will that also apply, 'если каждому, особенно с утра, потребности - сопьются все? 89 Krymov finds the implied assumption of equality particularly threatening. If equality, something which has always enthralled Krymov, is realised, then he is no longer necessary as a teacher and mentor. In the past, before Stalingrad, Krymov has always relied on the moral inferiority of soldiers to reinforce his personal authority. Conditions have changed. Grekov's men have grown in the face of adversity. Their sense of equality stems from shared dangers. It owes nothing to the Party. Krymov is an outsider:

Здесь связь Крымова с людьми не ладилась не потому, что они

были подавлены, растеряны, трусили. Здесь люди чувствовали себя сильными, уверенно, и неужели возникшее в них чувство силы ослабляло их связь с комиссаром Крымовым, вызвало отчужденность, враждебность и в нем и в них?90

Conscious of the change in relationship between them and the Party's representatives, Grekov's men boldly express their ideas for a new Russia. Abolition of the kolkhoz is a key demand. They see no reason why they should accept the discrepancies between the theory and practice of equality. Krymov can provide no answers to these questions. Tired of their insolence and continually rebuffed in his attempts to win their confidence, Krymov exposes his real aims. The veneer of comradeship falls away:

Я - военный комиссар, я пришел, чтобы преодолеть вашу недоступную партизанщину. 91

'Partizanshchina' epitomises the nature of the conflict between Grekov - and the men like him - and the Party. It is precisely this initiative and spirit of free wheeling independence, which is stopping the Germans. The Party recognizes its value, but also its dangers. The spirit represented by Grekov will cause serious problems in the aftermath of victory. It must be neutralised, prevented from coalescing into organised opposition. Krymov's conclusions are not unexpected:

Крымов теперь ясно видел в Грекове враждебное и чуждое, чего не могли ни уменьшить, ни заглушить героические дела, творившиеся в окруженном доме. 92

With regard to aims, the differences between Grekov and Krymov are irreconcilable. Grekov is not fooled by Krymov's claim that he too is fighting for freedom: 'На кой она вам. Вам бы только с немцами справиться'. 93 As he fully understands, having beaten the Germans, the Party would simply carry on as before, 'все на старые рельсы'. 94 Grekov wants more than the abolition of the kolkhoz, he wants an end to the coercion endemic in Soviet society, to what Krymov euphemistically refers to as the 'ход истории'. 95 The eventual destruction of house 6/1 symbolises an end to these hopes for change. It signifies the grey repressive years which followed in the wake of victory.

Wounded in strange circumstances, Krymov returns to headquarters.

He detects indifference, even hostility from others in the front's political directorate. Resented by his superiors, despised by Grekov and his men, Krymov finds himself in an ideological wilderness. His isolation is complete. Yet he clings onto the belief, by now the illusion, that the spirit of Lenin was present in house 6/1. Krymov's state of mind is complicated by his attitude towards Grekov, whom he blames for his wound and his enforced inactivity at headquarters, and thus indirectly for the condescension with which he is received by others. This becomes the dubious basis for his report:

Греков растлил, политически разложил воинское подразделение, произвел теракт: стрелял в представителя партии, военного комиссара. 96

Ironically, Krymov's superiors have already begun to consider the removal of Krymov's status as a 'representative of the Party'. Furthermore, Grekov senses that something much more profound than the lack of ideological orthodoxy in 6/1 is troubling Krymov. Krymov finds this unsettling. Abrasive, a brave professional soldier, Grekov is also a sensitive human being. Unsolicited recollections of the Stalinist terror come to Krymov as he writes his report. Thoughts that Stalin has violated the spirit of Lenin are overwhelmed by the belief that Stalin's iron discipline is more useful. In any case the general secretary has been declared by the Party to be 'непогрешимый, чуть ли не божественный!'. 97 Measured against the fate of Bukharin, Rykov and Zinoviev, Grekov's is insignificant. The Old Guard predetermines Krymov's response. Their fate removes his power of decision. Krymov endorses what has in effect already been decided. Yet he still experiences doubts:

Мыслимо ли, законно ли расправляться с такой жестокостью с членами ленинской партии? Вот Грекова расстреляют перед строем. Страшно, когда бьют по своим, Греков ведь не свой, он враг. 98

For all the apparent strength of his conviction that Grekov is an enemy Krymov cannot shake off a feeling of unease, even treachery: '...донос, что ли, я написал? Пусть и не ложный, но все же донос...'. 99 Grekov is spared the ignominy of execution, yet his memory is gratuitously insulted. Krymov's report denies him the posthumous award of the Hero of the Soviet Union and the chief of the

Special Section contends that Grekov has deserted to the Germans. No clearer statement of the division separating soldiers and commissars could be found.

News of Grekov's death exacerbates Krymov's submerged doubts. For the first time he begins to question the legality of 1937, and more importantly his own role:

Десятки людей, создавших вместе с Лениным большевистскую партию, оказались провокаторами, платными агентами иностранных разведок, а один лишь человек, никогда не занимавший центрального положения в партии, не знаменитый как теоретик, оказался спасителем дела партии, носителем истины. Почему они сознаются? 100

Why, he asks himself, did he not find the strength to dispute the charges made against Bukharin and the others? Did he believe, or was he just fooling himself? Alongside Krymov's doubts there is a grudging respect for Grekov. Krymov concedes that he was right:

Греков высказывал то, что подспудно чувствовалось во многих людях, то, что находясь под спудом, тревожило, интересовало, иногда влекло Крымова. 101

However, Grekov is not content to confine himself to thoughtcrime. He voices his opinions, encouraging others to do the same. He exposes the lie, underlining the weakness and submissiveness of Krymov. It is this as much as anything else which invites his destruction. Grekov is the voice of conscience:

Но едва это подспудное было высказано, Крымов ощутил злобу и вражду, желание согнуть Грекова. Если б понадобилось, он, не колеблясь, расстрелял бы Грекова. 102

Despite his personal loathing of the soulless bureaucrats who have risen with Stalin, Krymov and they are united for various reasons in their opposition to what Grekov represents. But Krymov's part in the conspiracy is worse, much worse even than in 1937. Five years later he cannot hide in the anonymous ranks of the Party faithful. As an individual he is wrong; and he knows it. In denouncing Grekov, Krymov condemns himself to the same fate that would have befallen Grekov, had he not been killed by the Germans.

Krymov's subsequent arrest is inevitable and coheres with the many undercurrents in Za pravoe delo and Zhizn' i sud'ba. Arrest is in

part the logical fulfilment of his own stated intention that he would not hesitate to eliminate those, who obstructed the path of revolution. If, as he believes, the Party has the right to function as the 'меч диктатуры' 103, then he can have no recourse to any higher moral or secular authority, when he too is cut down. The knife simile, the motif of cutting, is also to be found in Krymov's reaction to Grekov. Impervious to Krymov's crude persuasion, the malign effects of Grekov are only to be eradicated by the 'хирургический нож'. 104 It recalls Faktorovich in "Chetyre dnya" and thus the distortion of logic and morality bred by ideological fanaticism. Too late Krymov grasps that the sword of dictatorship is primarily intended for the ritual slaughter and purification of the Party's own ranks. Krymov cannot avoid or reject this corollary. To do so is to proclaim the sanctity of the individual: this he has always denied.

Individual conscience, suppressed for so long in the service of the revolution, begins to assert itself during his incarceration. Personal responsibility in the murder of the state's enemies cannot be brushed aside. Why now, Krymov asks himself, does the word donos sound so loathsome? 105 Success in his work as a military commissar was due to the system of informers which he used in army units. He has been directly responsible for the deaths of many soldiers. In prison their ghosts return to haunt him:

Красноармеец Маркевич заявил: « Все коммунисты воры, придет время, мы их поднимем на штыки, и народ станет свободной », - трибунал присудил Маркевича к расстрелу. Ведь он, доносчик, доложил в политуправление фронта о Грекове, не угробила бы Грекова немецкая бомба, его бы расстреляли перед строем командиров. Что чувствовали, думали эти люди, которых посылали в штрафные роты, судили трибуналы, допрашивали в особых отделах? 106

Nevertheless, Krymov still maintains, outwardly at least, that his actions were justified. A fellow prisoner asks whether he ever encountered signs of dissatisfaction among the troops at the front. Krymov denies that he has, thereby hoping to avoid awkward questions as to how he dealt with such manifestations of discontent. Questions of this nature and the ensuing discussion would destroy the illusion that he was justified in his denunciations. Yet Krymov's denial does

not help him. Having perceived and apparently avoided one of the snares inherent in the question, he immediately blunders into another. If, as he asserts, there were no signs of political discontent at the front, how does he explain the epidemic of desertions in 1941? More importantly, why has he been arrested? Should Krymov admit the possibility of error in his own case, he must also concede that thousands of others have been wrongly persecuted, and thus that the entire system is fatally and intrinsically flawed.

Krymov's encounter with Grekov attracted considerable attention from Soviet critics and readers. Igor' Zolotuskiy, writing in Literaturnaya gazeta, goes so far as to say:

Дом « шесть дробь один » - центр романа, центр не только географический, но и смысловой, потому что здесь осуществлена мечта о свободном самоуправлении и свободе отдельного человека. 107

Unlike Bocharov, Zolotuskiy adopts a more condemnatory stance towards Krymov's appearance in house 6/1. Bocharov tends to exonerate Krymov's behaviour, and to a large extent passes over the wider and deeper implications of 6/1 for both Zhizn' i sud'ba and thus Soviet society. Zolotuskiy bluntly refers to Krymov as an 'идейный доносчик'. 108

Particularly contentious is Bocharov's belief that Grossman and Krymov concur with one another on the aims of the war. Bearing in mind the radical differences between Krymov and Grekov - the latter exemplifying the very soul of the Stalingrad defence - such a view hardly merits serious consideration. We find a similar line of argument in the following:

То, до чего « дозревает » Крымов в тюремной камере, подступало к автору в его трудных раздумьях над сталинградской « интерпретацией » революционных идеалов. 109

It is difficult to comprehend what exactly is meant by 'the Stalingrad interpretation of revolutionary ideals'. Bocharov would appear to imply that Grossman's interpretation of the Stalingrad battle - quite unique in the annals of Soviet war literature - is somehow consistent with the aims of the Revolution which Krymov seeks to reassert. This is not the case. For Grossman and Grekov it is indeed a Great

Fatherland War. Such a notion is unacceptable to Krymov. Certainly, he undergoes a process of maturation in prison. Its beginnings are evident in Za pravoe delo. But prior to his arrest he suppresses his doubts and as V. Kardin has observed, Krymov's impassioned speeches and reports are, apart from anything else, intended to, 'подавить собственные колебания'.¹¹⁰ Slowly, painfully, Krymov begins to understand the real role of the commissar. His conscience is not fooled by his own evasive answers to fellow prisoners. On the other hand Grossman's 'difficult thoughts' arose from the understanding, which we find in Grekov, that the great sacrifice has stopped the invader, but strengthened the hand of tyranny at home. Had he not been arrested Krymov would have been a willing participant in the extirpation of the 'недобрый, не советский зеленый дух'¹¹¹, manifested by Grekov and his fellow travellers.

VI

Krymov's fall from grace stems partly from the new spirit among the Stalingrad defenders. As victory at Stalingrad became a realistic possibility a different set of political and ideological priorities emerged. First among these was the need to ensure that the Army's newly acquired confidence, coupled with their access to the means of physical violence, did not present a threat to the Party. The commissar required little military expertise for such a task. He was primarily a party bureaucrat, whose abilities to intrigue on the Party's behalf were much more highly regarded than familiarity with logistics and strategy. With such terms of reference the commissar viewed all manifestations of independence and professional autonomy on the part of the military with deep suspicion. Krymov's background made him unacceptable to both soldiers and the Party. With bitter memories of collectivisation and 1937, soldiers were not prepared to trust someone whom they saw as a threat to their post-war aspirations. For its part, the Party members, particularly those who made their careers in the 1930s, found Krymov's zeal and loyalty to Marx and Lenin threatening. Krymov typified for them the Old Guard many of whom they had denounced to get ahead. Moreover, Krymov lacked the supreme pragmatism which characterised the new careerists. Quite

willing to eliminate enemies of the Revolution, he was unwilling to accommodate himself to those such as his superior, Tosheev, whom he perceives as, 'Случайные для партии, не связанные с ленинской традицией люди'.¹¹² In this climate of ideological expediency there was no room for, 'a coelacanthine Party official'¹¹³ such as Krymov.

Numerous representatives of this new type of commissar can be found in Zhizn' i sud'ba. All Grossman's important soldiers are linked to commissars and each pairing illuminates some particular aspect of the soldier/commissar antithesis. Significant in this respect is the conflict between Major Ershov and Commissar Osipov, both of whom are in German captivity.

Ershov is another fine example of Grossman's soldiers. Physically and mentally unbreakable, he attracts a large following among fellow prisoners in the camp. Ershov's reputation for toughness is well deserved. Manhandled by one of the German guards, Ershov strikes him across the face. Ershov's spontaneous refusal to submit to brutality has a salutary effect on the German, who, stunned by such resistance, does not kill him, but accords him a level of respect unknown in the camps. In other aspects Ershov's biography is depressingly familiar. Following the arrest and deportation of his father as a kulak, Ershov was not accepted into the military academy. Unperturbed, he visits his father in exile, as a result of which he is thrown out of the Army, only to be recalled at the outbreak of war. Grossman highlights Ershov's Russianness. His frequent gesture of scratching his chest evokes a bear, the archetypal symbol of national strength and fearlessness. Charisma and personal warmth are compared to the radiant heat of a Russian stove. Ershov symbolises the powerful elemental forces of the Russian countryside. His physical and moral strength inspire devotion. Uncontrolled by bureaucracy these forces carry others along with them:

Ершов переживал горькое и хорошее чувство - здесь, где анкетные обстоятельства пали, он оказался силой, за ним шли. Здесь не значили ни высокие звания, ни ордена, ни спецчасть, ни первый отдел, ни управление кадров, ни аттестационные комиссии, ни звонок из райкома, ни мнение зама по политической части.¹¹⁴

Ershov rather than the Party is the, 'выразитель мыслей и идеалов

лагерного общества'. 115

Ershov's aims are quite distinct from those of the Party. He sees the struggle against the Germans as being one for internal freedom, as much as one to liberate Russian occupied territory from an external enemy:

...победа над Гитлером, станет победой и над теми лагерями смерти, где погибли его мать, сестры, отец. 116

Not surprisingly there are sufficient grounds in Ershov's background to make him the subject of considerable suspicion from the likes of Osipov. Suspicions are strengthened by Ershov's influence among the prisoners, and in particular by the plan which he has conceived to resist the Germans. Ershov seeks to establish a network of informers in the camp, gradually amassing a large enough supply of arms to instigate an armed uprising throughout the camp system in Europe. His final aim, is, he tells Mostovskoy, the creation of a, 'единая, свободная Европа'. 117 Thus, Ershov represents a twofold danger. Not only does he serve as a non-ideological focal point of resistance to German rule, but he pursues a vision of Europe which is diametrically opposed to that of the Party and Stalin's post-war plans.

Osipov's indifference to the abolition of the Comintern, a wartime gesture by Stalin to his Western allies, is in marked contrast to Krymov. For Krymov Internationalism was the bedrock on which Communism was founded. Osipov endorses the words of General Gud' in conversation with Mostovskoy:

Вот через ваше интернациональное воспитание драп начался, надо было в патриотическом духе воспитывать народ, в русском духе. 118

Superficially, one might think that this serves to dispel any hostility on the part of Osipov towards Ershov; on the contrary it intensifies it. Osipov is quite prepared to encourage Russian nationalism, but within a framework laid down by the Party. There is no place for Ershov's dangerous spontaneity and infectious, non-political optimism. Unable to manipulate him, Osipov arranges for Ershov's transfer to Buchenwald and almost certain death in the gas chambers. Ideological considerations determine Osipov's decision:

Сразу обнаружилось раздвоение в руководстве. К Ершову существовала стихийная тяга со стороны многих. Это кружило

ему голову. Он ни за что не подчинился бы центру. Человек он неясный, чужой... У нас получились два центра - беспартийный и партийный. 119

Unlike Krymov Osipov is not moved by the military calamities of 1941:

О военном поражении первых месяцев войны говорил умно, но в нем нет горя, говорит с какой-то безжалостностью шахматиста. 120

Chess provides us with an apposite analogy. As in chess Osipov follows long-term objectives, while at the same time forming short-term alliances and compromises. In 1937 as the deputy of a military academy he denounced dozens of students as enemies of the people. Whether Osipov did this for ideological or purely personal reasons is uncertain, but his attitude towards the professional military is one of resentment, and even contempt. Osipov has none of the doubts which begin to plague Krymov about means and ends. Whatever the differences which exist and separate Krymov from soldiers, one finds it difficult to believe that he would be capable of exploiting German death camps to kill Russian soldiers. He would, one feels, at least afford them the dubious distinction of being executed by the Soviet security organs.

Osipov frequently relates comical anecdotes about various senior military figures, one of whom, Eremenko, plays a major role in the victory at Stalingrad. With disturbing openness he admits to Ershov that Tukhachevskiy, Egorov and Blyukher were, . . . 'виноваты так, как я да ты'. 121 Underlying this admission is a mixture of belief in Party infallibility, that the Party always recognises its enemies, and the cynical view that an enemy is anyone deemed by the Party to be one. For Ershov this has fatal consequences. The differences between Osipov and Ershov are thus more fundamental than ideology: they are moral and spiritual. His sensitive political antennae always ensure that Osipov behaves in accordance with the Party's wishes. Ershov adheres to a simple, but absolute code: evil in all its manifestations is to be resisted.

VII

To this increasingly prominent category of commissar must be added Dementiy Trifonovich Getmanov, one of the most masterfully drawn and

compelling portraits of a party official to be found anywhere in Soviet prose. A striking feature of Getmanov's life is the absence of any outstanding achievement. Unlike Krymov he has seen no active service in the Civil War. Tsarist persecution was never visited on him and he shows none of the erudition and intellectual capacity which we associate with Krymov and Mostovskoy. At party conferences he reads reports written by others. Assigned as the personal guard to a minor official, Getmanov comes to the attention of the party apparatus, and in the aftermath of 1937 becomes the secretary of the district party committee, 'хозяином области'.¹²² It is a fitting title, since Getmanov enjoys the power to destroy the careers and even the lives of hundreds of professionally qualified people. Academics, doctors, engineers and other specialists seek his patronage.

Mediocrity is the key to Getmanov's meteoric rise. Bereft of any remarkable personal or intellectual qualities, he succeeds in the Party because he commits himself so unhesitatingly and uncritically to its precepts; he embodies the 'дух партийности'.¹²³ The reward is the Party's trust:

Доверие партии! Гетманов знал великое значение этих слов. Партия доверяла ему! Весь его жизненный труд, где не было ни великих книг, ни знаменитых открытий, ни выигранных сражений, был трудом огромным, упорным, целеустремленным, особым, всегда напряженным, бессонным. Главный и высший смысл этого труда состоял в том, что возникал он по требованию партии и во имя интересов партии. Главная и высшая награда за этот труд состояла в одном - в доверии партии. ¹²⁴

Trust reflects the approval of Stalin, the highest embodiment of the party line, in whose name Getmanov acts.

Poshlost' and Gogolian satire feature in Grossman's portrayal of Getmanov. The name Getmanov is an ironic reminder of its bearer's military ignorance. Its root suggests hetman, a Cossack military commander, a role for which Getmanov is singularly unsuited. Indeed Getmanov is not the only commissar whose name has satirical connotations: Neudobnov's name (his colleague at the front) suggests neudobnyy, 'uncomfortable', or 'embarrassing': Osipov, the verb osipat', to go hoarse; and Pivovarov, pivovar, brewer. Initially

perturbed by his appointment to the front, interpreting it as a loss of favour, Getmanov, convinces himself of its importance, 'В танковый корпус пошлют не каждого'.¹²⁵ As Getmanov stands before a mirror, resplendent in a new uniform, pronouncing his rank with obvious relish, one is reminded of any number of Gogol's dead souls. Similarly, we note Getmanov's desk, described as being, 'просторный как степь'.¹²⁶ Such hyperbole in similes of characterization is unusual in Grossman. Yet the image is effective. It conveys a bureaucrat's table free from the stationery accoutrements associated with bureaucracy. Getmanov's function is not to concern himself with the minutiae of administration. It consists of the execution of the Party's wishes. As spacious as the steppe, the table is a symbol of the immense power he wields, the extent of his influence.

Humour is rare in Grossman, but there are instances of it occasionally. Perusing Getmanov's photographic album, a guest finds a portrait of Stalin which has been defaced by Getmanov's son: Stalin appears with blue earrings and beard. Getmanov is reminded of an incident before the war in which a student fired at a portrait of Stalin from an air rifle. Eventually the miscreant was arrested, denounced by a colleague who feared his own arrest for remaining silent. The reference is clear: the student was denounced as a precaution. Despite the fact that his own son is only five years old Getmanov is anxious lest the incident be used against him. He remembers the past and fears the future. The incident is illuminating as well as humorous. It is precisely the kind of minor detail which Getmanov himself so ruthlessly exploits in his manipulation of others.

Biographically Getmanov is associated with Khrushchev. We are given to believe that Khrushchev, then serving as a member of the military council at Stalingrad remembers Getmanov from their work in the Ukraine. That Khrushchev served in this capacity on the Stalingrad front is an historically established fact.¹²⁷ Whether Getmanov is modelled after a specific figure is not clear. Following the pattern of Grossman's other characters this is most likely. More than that it makes a telling swipe at Khrushchev himself. The suggestion from Grossman that Khrushchev would patronise Getmanov cannot have endeared him to a man to whom Grossman wrote an impassioned plea for the release of Zhizn' i sud'ba. Indeed, it is

not unthinkable that Getmanov was based on Khrushchev himself. His connections with the Ukraine and his wartime appointment as commissar point in this direction. This would be an even stronger reason as to why Khrushchev remained resolutely deaf to Grossman's request.

In conversation with his party cronies Getmanov reveals his attitude towards the military. Although he has yet to meet Novikov, the commander to whose headquarters he will be attached, Getmanov takes an instinctive dislike to him, irritated by his alleged professionalism. The initiative and vigour with which Novikov has pursued his concept of the tank battle - an allusion to Za pravoe delo - are inconceivable for someone like Getmanov, who always reacts to authority, but never initiates anything himself. Asked for his opinion of Novikov, Getmanov is dismissive:

Да вот такой, выдвигенец военного времени, до войны
ничем особым он не отличался. 128

In the light of Getmanov's rapid career advancement, before and during the war, on the basis of non-achievement, his remarks abound in irony. However, his assertion is not entirely false. Novikov undoubtedly owes his promotion to high command to the war, as he himself realises. Yet his progress is due to the changing methods of mechanised warfare. Novikov's success reflects innate ability, dedication and experience. Unlike Getmanov, he has not made his career through denunciation and unthinking obedience. Novikov reminds Getmanov of his mediocrity, which further fuels his resentment towards the professional soldier. Similarly, among Getmanov's supporters there is indignation that General Neudobnov, an unimaginative and loyal party member, has been subordinated to Novikov as his chief of staff. Neudobnov's suitability for command is based on his experience of state work, a euphemism for an active role in the Terror, alluded to in Za pravoe delo. Complete military ignorance is not seen as a serious stumbling block. Getmanov is more realistic about Neudobnov's job expectations, yet he is not unsympathetic. Aware of the limitations of the party cadres in military matters, he nevertheless believes that they should enjoy comparable status and authority.

Ominously for Novikov the question of his relationship with Zhenya is raised, which in turn draws attention to Krymov. Even at this stage in the narrative things look black for Krymov. No secret is

made of the fact that he is considered a 'загибщик' 129 and there is open discussion of his links with Rightists and Trotskiyists from very early on. The full significance of these revelations is not lost on Getmanov:

А Гетманов, сам любивший ошеломить собеседника смелостью, простотой и искренностью, хорошо знал о сокровенной глубине, молчавшей под поверхностью живого, не посредственного разговора. 130

For Novikov the consequences are potentially fatal. Should the need arise, such associations with Krymov, however tenuous and indirect, will form the basis of a denunciation. As one of Getmanov's colleagues menacingly puts it, 'а забывать нам ничего не положено'. 131

Listening to her husband's machinations, Getmanov's wife is baffled by the importance attached to the marital prospects of Novikov and Zhenya. Notwithstanding their naivety, her comments are nevertheless pertinent, when one considers Russia's situation:

Странно даже слушать ваш разговор, и как будто войны нет, а только заботы - на ком этот комкор женится, и кто бывший муж у его будущей жены. Ты с кем это, Дима, собрался воевать? 132

The discussion amid the atmosphere of cosy domesticity is an essential preamble to future developments in the relationship between Getmanov and Novikov. It highlights the huge disparity between the grasping, philistine and ruthless apparatchik, who has sold his soul to the Party, and the warm, caring and comme il faut persona, which he adopts among Novikov's men.

Novikov's interaction with Getmanov and Neudobnov is one of the most important narrative lines in Zhizn' i sud'ba and thoroughly explores the conflict of interests between Party and Army. It begins during the training and preparation of Novikov's new command, at a stage when he is still ignorant of his mission at Stalingrad, extending through the counter-offensive in which Novikov's tank corps plays a decisive role. As in other areas of modern war Grossman's knowledge of the peculiarities of the tank soldier is impressively detailed. Intrinsically valuable, it attests the immense gulf in knowledge of military matters which divides Novikov and Getmanov. Ignorance on Getmanov's part is perhaps understandable. However, he

makes no attempt to eliminate the gaps in his knowledge, preferring instead to insinuate himself, as he privately admits, by striking the 'правильная линия'. 133

Differences in attitudes and priorities separating the two men come quickly to the fore. Getmanov's ebullience saps Novikov's confidence. Proposing a toast to the men under his command, who have completed their training, Novikov belatedly includes one to Stalin, annoyed that Getmanov has noticed his clumsy haste. But Getmanov responds enthusiastically:

Что же, ладно, за старичка, за батьку нашего. Доплыли до волжской воды под его водительством. 134

This is Getmanov at his most dangerous; it is an invitation for Novikov to castigate Stalin's incompetence in allowing the Germans to reach the Volga. Novikov does not take the bait, but he is baffled by Getmanov's words, uncertain as to how they should be interpreted:

Новиков посмотрел на комиссара, но что прочтешь на толстом, скуластом, улыбающемся лице умного сорокалетнего человека с прищуренными, высокими и недобрыми глазами. 135

Equally dangerous are Getmanov's efforts to elicit a compromising answer from Novikov concerning the purges in the Army. He recalls Neudobnov's and his own involvement, seeking quite deliberately to provoke Novikov:

Славный, хороший человек. Большевик. Сталинец настоящий. Большой опыт руководящей работы. Выдержка большая. Я его помню по тридцать седьмому году. Его Ежов прислал произвести расчисточку в военном округе, а я, знаете, в ту пору, сам не яслями заведовал. Но уж он поработал. Не дядя, а топор, по списку в расход пускал... 136

Perplexed by what he perceives to be a note of reproach for the excesses of 1937, Novikov acknowledges the loss:

Да, сказал медленно и неохотно Новиков, кое-то наломал в ту пору дров. 137

Recollections of his participation in the purges serve a less obvious function. They are designed to assert a psychological authority over Novikov. In essence they constitute a threat. Novikov may be the nominal head of the corps, but real power inheres in the office represented by Getmanov and Neudobnov. It is a reminder that

Novikov's career and life are in their hands. Grossman is without a doubt, 'мастер психологической детали'.¹³⁸ Getmanov continues the process of psychological intimidation throughout his relationship with Novikov. While in Kuibishev on military matters, Novikov takes the opportunity to visit Zhenya. Getmanov wastes no time in demonstrating his knowledge of this fact. Novikov is to feel that every aspect of his life is under scrutiny, and that the Party's representatives are ubiquitous and omniscient. Getmanov is a master of innuendo. He is rendered particularly dangerous by the fact that his threats are never more than implied. Gestures of friendship create confidence and trust; an atmosphere in which damaging or potentially useful information is more likely to be revealed. Every word and deed has to be carefully measured. One can only agree with Lipkin's observation that, 'Искренность Гетманова внушает страх'.¹³⁹

Novikov's relationship with Zhenya proves the point. Getmanov informs Novikov that he has only recently learned from Neudobnov that Krymov's credentials nearly cost him his life in 1937. This is a lie. Getmanov knew of these details well before meeting Neudobnov, and he seeks more. Thus, he casually asks Novikov whether Krymov has ever spent any time in German captivity, convinced that Krymov has told his wife something incriminating about his breakout from encirclement. He is certainly no 'простодушный человек'¹⁴⁰, as he tells Novikov. Clearly, he wishes to hide from Novikov the full extent of his knowledge about Krymov's past. His reasons soon become apparent. Novikov challenges the relevance of Krymov's past for his present task. Getmanov, in a masterful, and barely discernible move, implies that these are Neudobnov's concerns, not his. With stunning deceit, aimed at winning Novikov's confidence, he adds that Neudobnov:

...энтузиаст тридцать седьмого года, его начетник,
с этих позиций не собьешь'.¹⁴¹

Attempting to dissociate himself still further from Neudobnov, he speaks sympathetically of numerous disgraced soldiers who have been rehabilitated and are now serving in the Army. Even Krymov, he adds, is serving at Stalingrad among the troops, a fully accredited member of the Party. The reference to Krymov is shrewd. It plays upon Novikov's love of Zhenya, and thus his likely jealousy towards Krymov. It produces the desired effect. Novikov bitterly attacks

what Getmanov has contrived to suggest are Neudobnov's opinions. However, in his anger, smouldering resentment and frustration, he reveals that Trotsky had been impressed by one of Krymov's articles. Had this information come to light in 1937, it would have sealed Krymov's fate there and then, as Zhenya told Novikov. Novikov's slip is the final nail in Krymov's coffin. Nor does it help Novikov. It would not be too difficult to fabricate the existence of a Trotskyist cell in the heart of the Army. Delighted by his success, Getmanov masks his satisfaction by a display of affection. Unaware of what he has done, Novikov mistakes Getmanov's behaviour as a sign of respect.

This scene illuminates the truly Machiavellian side to Getmanov's character. Well aware of Novikov's feelings for Zhenya, he offers Novikov an opportunity to rid himself of a rival. Incrimination of Krymov is not deliberate. Subconsciously, Novikov may well desire the removal of his rival. One could imagine him challenging Krymov face to face. Yet he is incapable of writing a donos. Instinctively, Getmanov perceives that Novikov knows something. His devious and treacherous talent consists in creating the requisite conditions, in which, Novikov, provoked and artfully manipulated, will reveal his secret. Getmanov unerringly taps the jealousy which lurks in every man's heart. He acquires more than information. Tempted, and having succumbed, Novikov loses his political innocence. Being a competent professional soldier is not enough. Getmanov has morally compromised him as well, drawing him into a world of intrigue.

For his part Neudobnov inspires a mixture of contempt and revulsion. Brutish and cunning, he embodies characteristics of the worst kind of party official. He and Getmanov are indeed united by a, 'прочная общность'.¹⁴² Throughout his career Neudobnov has occupied himself with the darker side of the Party. He has connections with the OGPU, and before the war, at a time when the overwhelming majority of Russians were frightened to associate with foreigners, Neudobnov travelled abroad. Like Getmanov he enjoys that priceless commodity: the Party's trust. Ruthlessly acquisitive, there is a hint from Grossman, that Neudobnov, in addition to the immense privileges conferred by nomenklatura status, has expropriated the possessions of purge victims. He is particularly proud of a shotgun he has acquired, and Novikov's comment that the Tsar probably owned one is a perceptive

insight into the new ruling élite. Power, and those who aspire to it, remain unchanged. Neudobnov's love of hunting, the pastime of the Tsarist autocracy, is also shared by General Gudz', one of the many incompetent officers with whom Ershov must cope in his proposed uprising. This minor parallel perhaps points to more fundamental ones: that both Novikov and Ershov face treachery and interference from military ignoramuses.

Neudobnov's obsession with simplistic ideological formulae distorts his already woefully limited grasp of military matters. He sees 'wreckers' and 'saboteurs' in every branch of Soviet society. He seems genuinely surprised that 'wreckers' should have penetrated such diverse trades as those involving the production of medical instruments and boots for the Army, a biting piece of sarcasm which Grossman shares with the reader. In all sincerity he relates to Novikov the case of 'the wrecker architects', whose nefarious plans to design streets in Moscow suitable for enemy planes to land on were exposed. Amazed by Neudobnov's apparent sincerity, Novikov dismisses the whole idea as, 'военно безграмотно'.¹⁴³ Notwithstanding his manifest ineligibility for military command Neudobnov regards his subordination to Novikov as merely an unwelcome necessity of wartime. With the war over this 'ненормальное положение' ¹⁴⁴ will be terminated. It is not so much the war which Neudobnov regards as an abnormal situation, but rather, one feels, the fact that he has to defer to Novikov. Moreover, he seems capable only of mouthing quotations from the works of Lenin and Stalin and is oblivious to the current military situation - so much so that even Getmanov has to remind him of the difference between slogans and reality. But Neudobnov remains unmoved:

Но Неудобнов пожал плечами, точно немцы, стоявшие на Волге, ничего не значили по сравнению с словами о том, что ни вершка своей земли не отдадим.¹⁴⁵

Yet for all its apparent rigidity Neudobnov's and Getmanov's perception of ideology differs considerably from that of Krymov or Mostovskoy. Its one inviolable tenet is the will of the current leader. Everything else is discarded or enhanced according to that principle. To quote Neudobnov:

Когда-то мы заключали с немцами Брестский мир, в этом был

большевизм, а теперь товарищ Сталин призвал уничтожить всех немцев-оккупантов до последнего, ... в этом большевизм...

В наше время большевик прежде всего - русский патриот. 146

In fact to talk of ideology with regard to Getmanov and Neudobnov is too flattering. Neither has any regard for intellectual activity, being content to serve as the conduits for the ideas of others.

Russian patriotism, the latest manifestation of Bolshevism, encroaches upon Novikov's right to appoint his officers. He considers a Major Basangov, a Kalmyk, to be the ideal candidate for the post of chief of staff in his second brigade. Getmanov objects on grounds of nationality, despite the fact that the designated appointee is a capable officer. Quite correctly, Novikov contends that in war the most important qualification is an officer's abilities. But Getmanov is adamant, untouched by the internationalism which enthused Krymov:

Нацмен еле в азбуке разбирається, а мы его в наркомы
выдвигаем. А нашего Ивана, пусть он семи пядей во
лбу, сразу по шапке, уступай дорогу нацмену!

Великий русский народ в нацменьшинство превратили.

Я за дружбу народов, но не за такую. Хватит! 147

Novikov capitulates, resenting the interference and painfully conscious of his own timidity. Operational efficiency is being impaired for spurious reasons. Having given in so easily, Novikov realises that he has indirectly contributed to this state of affairs. He protests to Neudobnov:

Моя ошибка, принес в жертву воинское умение анкетным данным.

На фронте выправим, там по анкетным данным не повоюешь. 148

Increasingly, Novikov questions the necessity of the commissars, and his own response to them. He is struck by his own timidity. Diffident and inarticulate in their presence, he confidently expects to overcome the Germans in battle. There exists a fundamental and grotesque imbalance:

люди, не знавшие калибров артиллерии, не умевшие грамотно
вслух прочесть чужой рукой для них написанную речь,
путавшиеся в карте, говорившие вместо « процент »,
« прбцент », « выдающий полководец », « Бёрлин », всегда
руководили им. Он им докладывал. 149

Their strength, as Novikov comprehends, lies in their ignorance.

Apparently resolute solutions derive from the near illiteracy of the commissars who propose them, and from their facile appreciation of complex questions. For all his expertise in military affairs Novikov is painfully wise to the fact that he does not exercise total control over his unit, and that he must still submit to an external authority represented by Getmanov and Neudobnov. Novikov's struggle with Getmanov and Neudobnov for moral and personal independence parallels the forthcoming battle with the Germans. To master the Germans effectively he must first overcome the influence of Getmanov, and break free from his spell. Novikov welcomes the opportunity:

Война покажет, кому Россия обязана, - таким, как он,
или таким, как Гетманов. 150

Roles are subtly reversed as they move closer towards the front. Getmanov discovers that certain officers are less susceptible to his brand of charm. This is especially the case with some of Novikov's brigade commanders. Lacking their combat experience, Getmanov feels a distinct sense of inferiority. On one occasion the mask of comradeship momentarily falls away, exposing this raw nerve. Resentful of Makarov's greater experience in battle and his aloofness, Getmanov angrily exclaims to Novikov:

Я из него вышибу философию сорок первого года! 151

Getmanov exposes more than personal resentment. Fundamental to the biography of nearly all Grossman's soldiers is the bitter, but educative experience of 1941. That Getmanov or Neudobnov have not been through this hard school prevents them from fully understanding the mentality of the frontovik or front line soldier. Novikov, Grekov, Ershov, Darenskiy and Berezkin belong to a select group, membership of which, unlike Getmanov's nomenklatura status, is gained on the basis of moral and physical courage of the highest order. Getmanov both resents and fears its exclusivity. On a more mundane level Getmanov's hypocrisy comes to light, weakening his authority over Novikov. He sees no contradiction between his affair with a nurse and the fact that he has rebuked Belov, one of Novikov's officers, for adultery. Yet such hypocrisy is only to be expected. It is an integral part of Getmanov's personal life and party work. Indeed, he cannot function without it.

Neither can the dangers of the front be ignored. For the first

time in the war Getmanov and Neudobnov experience the numbing effects of strafing. Getmanov follows Novikov's example and throws himself to the ground. Shaken, he has kept his nerve. Neudobnov has remained frozen to the spot. Getmanov makes light of it, suggesting that Neudobnov has displayed contempt for his life, but no one is fooled. Another episode is equally instructive for Neudobnov. Left alone at Novikov's headquarters, he begins to understand some of the problems faced by front line commanders, which he has hitherto dismissed as being of little consequence. Compared with a possible German tank attack party bureaucracy seems profoundly impotent:

Вдруг противник полезет - ведь от штаба до фронта шестьдесят километров. Тут не припугнешь снятием с должности, не обвинишь в связях с врагами народа. Прут танки и прут, чем их остановишь?...мощь государственного гнева,...не стоила ни гроша. 152

No less worrying for Neudobnov than the threat of a surprise attack is the fact that he would have sole responsibility in Novikov's absence. Accustomed to taking decisions - or rather implementing those of his superiors - , without the protective and supportive party hierarchy, Neudobnov finds such a prospect daunting.

Exposure to danger has a marked effect on Neudobnov. Several officers, among them Novikov, are discussing the course of the war. They criticise senior commanders who waste human life, impervious to casualties so long as objectives are achieved. At this juncture, Neudobnov, who himself has been directly responsible for the deaths of many, interjects that lives should be saved. They are, he says, 'наш самый драгоценный капитал'. 153 Neudobnov fails to convince. The economic metaphor betrays his real attitude: soldiers are a commodity to be expended. To Novikov's earlier expression of sympathy for a batch of young recruits going up to the front, Neudobnov reacts with indifference, almost contempt, 'кадры, бросовые, сопливые'. 154 Conversion to the belief that life should be saved reflects fear for his own skin. Novikov detects this spurious volte-face. Angered, he is blunt:

Если ты людей жалеешь, не лезь на командную
должность. 155

Such a remark articulates the dilemma faced by all competent

officers. For that reason it does not concern Getmanov or Neudobnov. Novikov is well aware of the awesome responsibility imposed by his position: the need to balance the loss of life with the attainment of his military objectives. Furthermore, he is struck by the fact that the high command are always ready to exact fearful penalties for loss of equipment, but seem unconcerned by excessive expenditure of life, or to use the military euphemism, 'живая сила'.¹⁵⁶ For Novikov, saving life is a paramount consideration; it embodies the profound and acute pathos of the commander, who, loving his men, must nevertheless send them into battle:

Тайная тайных войны, ее трагический дух были в праве одного человека послать на смерть другого человека.¹⁵⁷

This principle decisively influences Novikov in the opening stages of the counter-offensive. Eager to send his tanks forward into the breach created by the artillery barrage, Novikov notices that several concentrations of enemy guns remain unscathed. Heavy and unnecessary casualties will result if he orders his tanks forward in accordance with the predetermined schedule. Novikov delays the advance, incurring the wrath of his superior officers, who for their part are apprehensive of Stalin's impatience. Similarly, Getmanov applies pressure to stick to the plan despite the likelihood of heavy losses:

Необходимость жертвовать людьми ради дела всегда казалось ему естественной, неоспоримой не только во время войны.¹⁵⁸

However, Novikov resists the pressure for a premature advance. When his tanks finally move forward they encounter minimal resistance, and a vital phase of the battle succeeds. Morally and professionally this is Novikov's triumph over the weeks of frustration and submission to Getmanov's insidious influence. To quote Grigoriy Svirskiy:

Восемь минут своей жизни Новиков вел себя, как подсказывали ему его опыт и совесть.¹⁵⁹

Novikov's defiance is one of the moral beacons in Zhizn' i sud'ba. In delaying the advance he has sacrificed the praise of his superiors, who, it is fair to say, would have capitulated without a second thought. All chances of promotion have gone and the risk of arrest and execution is very real. But Novikov has discharged a higher duty:

Есть право большее, чем право посылать, не задумываясь, на смерть. право задуматься, посылая на смерть. Новиков

ИСПОЛНИЛ ЭТУ ОТВЕТСТВЕННОСТЬ. 160

Getmanov's reaction to Novikov's delay of the advance follows the established pattern of hypocrisy noted earlier. Outwardly, he congratulates Novikov in an excessive and mawkish display of warmth, which even the ossified Neudobnov attempts to outdo. However, the real Getmanov, devious, suspicious and always careful to safeguard his own interests, is not idle. No sooner has he bestowed congratulations on Novikov than he is writing what he euphemistically calls a letter in which Novikov's responsibility for the delay is outlined. Later, as it becomes apparent that Novikov's decision was justified, he and Neudobnov seek to persuade Novikov to abandon caution, hoping to reap the glory in being the first Soviet unit to cross the border into the Ukraine. Notwithstanding its minor military value, Novikov, too, is intoxicated with thoughts of victory. The three men share a common interest. Glory will be theirs, but failure will be exclusively Novikov's, as he knows:

Они ради этого готовы были пойти на любой риск, но одним лишь не хотели рисковать - принять на себя ответственность в случае неудачи. 161

Yet the advance cannot continue. Exhausted, Novikov's men need to rest and a halt is called for recuperation. Greedy for glory and full of menace, Getmanov alternately cajoles and mocks Novikov, hoping to persuade him to resume the advance. In desperation, he threatens to report Novikov to the Front Military Command. Just as inauspicious for Novikov are Getmanov's denials that he effusively thanked and kissed Novikov for his courageous decision to hold back the advance. Similarly, in what appears to be an allusion to Zhenya, he accuses Novikov of being 'под чуждым влиянием' 162. Getmanov's threats are real enough. Novikov's order is countermanded, and eventually he is removed from his post. Summoned to Moscow, he most likely perishes, the victim of Getmanov's donos.

The conflict between Novikov and Getmanov has a definite message for contemporary Soviet society. Initiative, responsibility and flexibility, all prominent themes of perestroyka, are seen to triumph over blind adherence to rules. Cynics might add that given Novikov's likely fate, such qualities are a liability. The villain of the piece is Getmanov, who in the context of Gorbachev's Russia, is an obvious

target for reform. Thus it is probably no coincidence that this particular episode was singled out for publication in the mass circulation weekly Ogonyok just at a time when the bureaucracy was coming under increasing attack in the press for its inertia. Many Soviet critics have recognised the significance of Getmanov. In the words of V. Kardin:

Давненько укоренился в нашей жизни Дементий Трифонович Гетманов, не распознанный, между прочим, литературой, готовый иной раз видеть его за того « положительного героя », которого десятилетиями ищет та часть нашей критики, что, подобно кадровикам, ценит в герое анкетную непорочность и умение произносить слова, соответствующие эпохе. 163

A. Bocharov, who has been markedly reticent about some of the uglier motives of the commissars generally, and Getmanov and Neudobnov most specifically, has made the following evaluation of the commissar theme in Grossman:

...он [Гроссман] приходит к пониманию того, насколько разными оказались затем Крымов и Гетманов, Мостовской и Осипов, Пивоваров и Пряхин. Комиссары для Гроссмана - по-прежнему революционная совесть народа, потому с ним больше и спрос. 164

The assertion that the commissars in Grossman represent a homogeneous body, motivated by similar concerns, and united by common aims, is decidedly hollow. It ignores the fundamental differences between them which we have noted. What exactly is meant by the term 'revolutionary conscience' is uncertain. But if it means a set of principles derived from the aims of the revolution and interpreted by a select few, then clearly there exists an insurmountable difference of approach between, for example, Krymov and Getmanov. Krymov naively and too dogmatically adheres to the belief that the aims of the war and the revolution are in harmony. In fact Bocharov insists that in Za pravoe delo Krymov is too orthodox. 165 Notions of conscience, revolutionary or otherwise, are utterly alien to Getmanov, Osipov and Neudobnov. Nor does the revolution's heritage especially interest Getmanov. Marx, Engels and Lenin are names to be invoked on appropriate occasions. They inspire no passion or intellectual admiration. Getmanov's raison d'être is the pursuit and exercise of power. Everything is sacrificed to that

end.

Traditionally in Soviet war literature the soldier and commissar are portrayed as being bound together by mutual respect and professional competence. Of course given his superior grounding in ideology and the trust of the Party, it is a relationship in which the commissar is very much primus inter pares. In this chapter it has been argued that in Narod bessmertn and Za pravoe delo Grossman indirectly challenges the assumptions underlying this relationship. Inconsistencies exist which cannot easily be explained away. In Zhizn' i sud'ba Grossman finally destroys the myth of commissar superiority, and thus the commissars' perceived right to lead professional soldiers. Whether among the beleaguered subunits of Stalingrad, or in German captivity, or accompanying the Army on their counter-offensive, the commissars put their own interests above those of the Army and to a large extent above the interests of the broad mass of Soviet people whom the Army represents. The effects of appointing commissars have yet to be fully researched. But one conclusion seems unavoidable: final victory was delayed, and achieved at much greater cost in lives, than if commissars had not been appointed.

Concepts of War and Progress

VI

I

War and progress are fundamentally and inextricably linked in the thought of Marxism-Leninism. Unless it serves the narrow and progressive interests of establishing the classless society war is reactionary and unjust. It is, 'based on private ownership and the division of society into classes'.¹ As human societies move closer to becoming a classless entity, one of the final goals of progress as envisaged by Soviet ideology, so they will become increasingly free from the, 'антагонистичность, противоречия прежних формаций'.² Liberated from the legacy of class hostility, and thus the scourge of war, mankind will stand on the threshold of a new era. Much of Grossman's writing challenges this understanding of progress and war, with profound implications for the vision of a Soviet Utopia.

One of the most important texts for this theme, in many respects a seminal work, is "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam". Written before the German invasion, the play develops an idea which first appeared in embryonic form in Stepan Kol'chugin; namely that historical phenomena are repeated ad infinitum. One of Sergey's friends quotes from a speech made by Claudius to the Roman Senate:

Все, почтенные сенаторы, что теперь считается очень старым,
было ново...и то, что мы сегодня подкрепляем примерами, само
будет в числе примеров.³

The title and one of the play's main themes allude to an apocryphal remark made by the Greek teacher, Eudemius, which is quoted by Grossman from Theodor Gomperz, the well known classical scholar:

If we are to believe the Pythagoreans, I shall once more
gossip among you, with this little staff in my hand, and
again as now ye will be sitting before me, and likewise will
it be with all the rest.⁴

This idea is not unique to the Pythagorean school of philosophy. It is to be found among the ideas of Anaximander, Heraclitus and Empidocles, and manifests itself in the modern era in Nietzsche's ideas of eternal recurrence.

The title of Grossman's play is provocative: who exactly are the Pythagoreans? Historically, the Pythagoreans were a school of Greek philosophy based on an apparently contradictory amalgam of mysticism and rationalism. Remote from the common people, they were an intellectual élite, delighting in the pursuit of knowledge. Their relevance for Soviet society is intriguing. Their esoteric body of knowledge, for which they were the sole interpreters and their élitism might well denote the ruling oligarchy of the Soviet state. However, the analogy is not entirely satisfactory when one considers the Pythagorean concept of time.

Marxist-Leninist teleology is predicated on the belief that time is linear. Such an assumption is indispensable for its Utopian ideology. Indeed, the same belief in the linear progression of time underpins much of the ethos of Western capitalism. Cyclical time is inimical to both ideologies. For cyclical time would mean that history was a series of events doomed to be repeated in an endless cycle of millennia. Wars, poverty and famine, afflictions which both ideologies claim to be able to surmount, would be ineradicable features of the human condition. Progress towards a unique and strife-free world would be a mirage. Furthermore, Pythagorean researches in the field of mathematics led to the startling discovery that the root of 2 was irrational. This challenged the notion of mathematical perfection, often cited to vindicate the claims of scientific communism. Indirectly, Grossman adopts a similar line to that taken by Zamyatin, who in We (My) cleverly exploited concepts of irrationality to cast doubt upon the advocates of rationalism. Much of what is associated with the Pythagoreans is obviously threatening for Soviet orthodoxy; and on one level that is their significance. They question certain assumptions, above all the concept of inexorable progress irrespective of the human cost. They are heretics.

Yet the indictment of heresy cannot be consistently applied. Having made the discovery that the square root of 2 was irrational, the Pythagoreans suppressed their discovery. They found the implications too disconcerting. An even greater doctrinal crisis arose from one of the key Pythagorean concepts; that of the dualism of limit and unlimit. It proved impossible to apply the opposite of odd and even to geometry. The major stumbling block was the

reconciliation of unrelated pairs, a problem which was unconvincingly resolved by equating odd numbers with limit, and even with unlimit. Grossman was well aware of this conundrum among the Pythagorean mathematicians. In Stepan Kol'chugin, whose final chapters are in many respects the most interesting, and which are contemporaneous with the writing of "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam", one can locate specific references to the question:

В древности школа пифагорейцев, познав основные отношения между цифрами, обожествила числа: « двоица », « троица », « четверица »; чет соответствует неограниченному, нечет - ограниченному, любовь - отказе, ну вот - мистика числа! Обаяние чисел! 5

Discrepancies between prediction and result in the Pythagorean doctrine of limit and unlimit find a cogent parallel in the disparity between Marxist-Leninist theory and practice. Moreover, since the discovery of flaws and inconsistencies originated from within the school itself, Grossman's Pythagorean analogue implies not merely heresy - which while it has negative connotations from the standpoint of orthodoxy, at least suggests intellectual integrity - but hypocrisy and treacherous cynicism. The Party's right to power stems from the claim that it, and it alone, is the moral and intellectual heir to Lenin, that it believes in Lenin's teachings. In Stalin's Russia these considerations are of little consequence. Thus the arch-heretics, if one may apply such a term in this context, are not those who question (bad enough in itself) the validity of Marxism-Leninism, but those in authority, who, realising that it is bankrupt, nevertheless continue to implement it in a form suitable to their needs.

One further aspect of the Pythagorean school would seem to have some relevance for Soviet Russia. After Pythagoras died, the school split into two sects. The Acousmatics, or Pythagorists, preserved the mystical side of his teaching, whereas the mathematicians concentrated on the scientific aspects. Of the two halves the mathematicians were better grounded in the teachings of Pythagoras. The Acousmatics had only studied a summary of the master's works. One is tempted to see the split among the Pythagoreans as an allusion to that which occurred in the Communist Party after Lenin's death. Trotskiy, the brilliant

theorist, and himself a mathematician, could easily assume the role of the Mathematicians' leader, while Stalin's more mediocre talents in this direction, combined with his pragmatism, invite comparison with what is represented by the Acousmatics.

The main advocate of the cyclical view of time in "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam" is the aging engineer Shatovskoy, who throughout the play repeats variations on the following, 'Вся жизнь подчинена великому закону цикличности'.⁶ His age and experience are particularly relevant. Having lived through the First World War and the Revolution he has ample grounds for viewing the optimism of Varnavitskiy, his ideological counterpart, with scepticism. For his part Varnavitskiy rejects Shatovskoy's fatalism. He does not accept that:

...люди обречены повторять слабости, несовершенства
ушедших поколений, ...Наша сила в движении, наша победа в
движении, пока мы живы, мы идем вперед. Человечество
пойдет за нами!⁷

War in Europe vitiates this claim. At the time this was written, Russia was not yet at war, but German military successes in the Mediterranean, and the bombing campaign against British cities were closely followed in the Soviet Union.

Shatovskoy regards the war between Britain and Germany as a rerun of World War One. This would appear to be a conventional stance. From the official Soviet standpoint the war between Germany and Britain was simply a war between two deadly capitalist rivals. Cyclical time adds a new dimension. If the war is, as Shatovskoy claims, a repetition of World War One, then this must mean that at some stage Germany and Russia will come to blows. According to the pattern of World War One Russia would lose - with all the consequences that that would entail for Stalin's survival. Thus, the relationship between the two World Wars could be judged to conceal the hope that Stalin might fall in the event of a German invasion. At the very least there could seem to be here implied criticism of Soviet foreign policy in the form of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. This latter point finds some support in Shatovskoy's statement that, . . .И снова Россия перед великой войной,....⁸ Grossman seems to have harboured no illusions as to Germany's real intentions. That the play was due to

be staged on the 23rd June 1941 is not without some irony. The suggestion that Russia's peace is soon to end can also be found in "Several Sad Days" ("Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dney"; 1963), one of Grossman's pre-war rasskazy which will be examined in detail in the final chapter. As in "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam" the war between Britain and Germany is referred to in news bulletins. German military success casts a shadow over Russia's peace:

И какая будничность в этих сообщениях...словно экономический бюллетень - тоннаж судов, брутторегистровые тонны, а рядом пожары, видные через Ла-Манш, взрывы, которые слышны за сто километров, гибель населения. 9

The strains of the International which conclude the broadcast complete the illusion of normality. War, not peaceful coexistence, is the reality of Europe.

The arguments between Shatovskoy and Varnavitskiy resemble a religious dispute. Here, the theme of belief, referred to in the title, assumes special importance. Shatovskoy does not dogmatically assert the conventions of the Pythagoreans. He views them with a healthy scepticism, while seeking evidence to support them. His approach is that of the scientist. Acceptance of the Pythagoreans is partially conditioned by his loss of faith in success, which in the context of the play, is synonymous with progress: 'Я потерял веру в успех'.¹⁰ Belief in progress is the cornerstone of Varnavitskiy's political philosophy. His rebuttal of the Pythagoreans raises interesting questions: 'но другой великий древний учил, что жизнь идет вперед могучим потоком'.¹¹ Why, for example, does Varnavitskiy not quote from the copious writings of Marx, Lenin, or even Stalin, in order to make his point? After all the idea of progress which he advocates is founded on the principles of dialectical materialism, allegedly the highest stage in man's political consciousness. If the idea of forward movement or progress was also expounded on in the ancient world, its modern adherents can hardly claim it to be an original discovery of socialist thought. By referring to an ancient philosopher, Varnavitskiy inadvertently confirms the Pythagorean aphorism, the validity of which he seeks to deny. Ideas as well as physical phenomena repeat themselves.

Varnavitskiy refers to the law of forward movement as a, 'Великий,

суровый закон' 12, adding that, . . . 'Никто в мире не верит в него, как мы'. 13 Faith is the essence of the doctrine. Varnavitskiy offers no verifiable evidence, no scientific proof, to support the existence of a law of forward movement; it cannot be deduced from experience. To quote J. B. Bury, a trenchant critic of these ideas:

..., the Progress of humanity belongs to the same order of ideas as Providence or personal immortality. It is true or it is false, and like them it cannot be proved either true or false. Belief in it is an act of faith. 14

Furthermore, progress depends on the assumption of continuously expanding scientific knowledge, knowledge which has a practical application. This, too, is an act of faith.

Varnavitskiy's arguments are highly subjective and betray all the signs of the religious fanatic. Having assumed the existence of a law of forward movement, he deifies it as 'great and stern'. Epithets such as this belong to a god. But for Varnavitskiy this is exactly what progress is. It is a new idolum saeculi, for which no sacrifice is too great. Those who do not believe are heretics or madmen:

Только безумцы могут возомнить, что мы устанем, оглянемся, свернем, как ветер на круги свои. Наша мудрость в движении. 15

'Wisdom in motion' reflects the strength and weakness of the current philosophy. The relentless forward movement brushes aside all opposition. No rational discussion of the issues is tolerated. All dissent is crushed. In the words of Mikhail Heller, the Plan, . . . 'became an ethical category, which explained and justified the behaviour of the builders of the new world'. 16 Yet the longer the process continues, the greater the number of victims. The notion of progress, now married to that of palingenesis, becomes indispensable to stifle their cries, justifying still greater sacrifice. Hence the reason why Shatovskoy calls the flow of life 'жестокий' 17, not 'великий' as does Varnavitskiy. Varnavitskiy's obsession with movement and progress reflects the same passionate commitment which we find in Mostovskoy and Krymov. In the words of Igor Ded'kov, who has identified this vital flaw in the revolutionary mentality:

Останавливаться нельзя, надо идти вперед, они пылают верой и энтузиазмом. прекрасные абстракции сжигают их мозг. В этом

безоглядном движении есть романтика, поначалу она кажется революционной, но опомнившиеся вдруг видят: романтика покорности, романтика веры, замешанная на страхе и чувстве самосохранения. 18

Similarly, in Vse techet Grossman leaves us in no doubt. For the revolutionary: 'цель - ничто, движение - все'. 19

Death is the most potent challenge to Varnavitskiy's determined enthusiasm. Progress is an abstraction. It is by no means certain that it will attain its goals. Of death there can be no such doubts; it mocks the idea of progress. In the case of Monakhov, Leva's father, death is welcomed. He bemoans the introduction of new mining equipment, since this will lead to change in mining practice, and deny him the opportunity to die like his father. The struggle to build a better society has taken its toll. Youthful zeal has given way to tiredness, and clarity of vision has dimmed. His belief that, . . . 'Жизнь - это не арифметика. Всего не объяснишь' 20, recognises the mystery of death, and is diametrically opposed to the confidence with which Varnavitskiy envisages the present and future. The play's conclusion confirms the unassailability of death, its paradox. Shatovskoy dies at the very moment when he achieves recognition of his work.

Varnavitskiy's panegyric to progress is undermined on a more quotidian plane. He attempts to convince Leva, a young man, that there are more important things in life than the love of a woman. His arguments go unheeded. At the end of scene six we learn that Leva, rejected in love, has attempted to hang himself. Having survived this farce, Leva now works an eighteen hour day. He appears to be a staunch convert to Varnavitskiy's extreme brand of utilitarianism. Yet the apostasy looks fragile. The enthusiasm, taken to extremes, suggests a sarcastic comment on contemporary Soviet literature, exemplified in the departure of Zhenya, the former object of his affections, for her father's place of work. Leva observes:

...все хорошо - молодожены, отец, мать, все цветут и работают, как в современной пьесе. 21

Soviet responses to "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam" were predictably hostile. By far the harshest assessment came from Vladimir Ermilov in Pravda. He scorned the idea that the Pythagoreans could be taken

seriously, arguing that Grossman:

... 'кокетничает с глубоко чуждой советским людям философией, с реакционными, давно обветшалыми идеями. 22

One of the main thrusts of Ermilov's invective consisted in the following:

Выходит, что не большевистская партия, с ее передовой идеологией, философией диалектического материализма, руководит советским обществом. 23

Ermilov also criticised Grossman on account of the play's title, which he said was, 'уклончиво-претенциозное'. 24 Evasiveness and ambiguity offer significant advantages. But they can be readily exploited by the hostile critic, who is able to ignore, or turn any ambiguities against the author. This Ermilov does in his attack on Grossman's play. Despite Ermilov's manifest hostility - very much in keeping with the ideological rigidity of the Zhdanovshchina - he shows a clear grasp of the implications and questions raised in "Esl' verit' pifagoreytsam". An unattributed article in Znamya supported Ermilov, but widened the scope of criticism to include the journal's editorial board:

Редакция « Знамени » совершила серьезнейший промах, опубликовав эту пьесу, являющуюся крупнейшей идейной и творческой ошибкой В. Гроссмана, хорошо работавшего во время войны, что по закону контраста только подчеркивает вредность и малохудожественность этой его довоенной пьесы. 25

Unfortunately for Grossman his ideas were linked with Oswald Spengler and Friedrich Nietzsche, ... 'прямые предшественники фашизма'. 26 Grossman was certainly familiar with some of Nietzsche's ideas as can be seen from Za pravoe delo, but he was no follower. For the present discussion Spengler is the more important of the two and there appear to be several places in Grossman's art where a definite correlation with Spengler can be identified.

Spengler's main work, The Decline of the West (Der Untergang des Abendlandes; 1918) was first published in Russian translation in 1923 27, and his central theme - decline - is implicit in the Pythagorean concept of circular time. Another important motif in Spengler, which is germane to this pre-war play and Grossman's post-war work, is the

Schicksalsidee or concept of fate. Spengler submits the view that modern science with its relevance on intellectual systems and models is a manifestation of, . . . 'unbewußten Hasses gegen die Mächte des Schicksales, des Unbegreiflichen'.²⁸ One of the main consequences of rationalist and scientific research, he argues, is the belief that mankind is moving towards a definite goal; Varnavitskiy clearly subscribes to this belief. Laws are essential. They provide a scientific basis for progress. But they are not the laws of physics or chemistry; they are the laws of causality (Kausalgesetze 29). In fact they are not laws at all. They describe rather than prescribe. Thus teleology is illusory. It is, . . . 'eine Karikatur der Schicksalsidee'.³⁰ With some justification, Ermilov asks, why struggle for anything, if everything is beyond our control?

Western criticism, while less vitriolic, generally has little good to say about Grossman's play. Shimon Markish's evaluation is the most severe:

По моему убеждению, во всем наследии Гроссмана нет ничего хуже этой пьесы. Вся насквозь она фальшива, ложнопатетична, псевдофилософична.³¹

Markish ignores the element of Chekhovian farce and black humour. More importantly, in dismissing the philosophical aspects as false, he suggests that Grossman did not take the implications of the Pythagoreans seriously. It would, therefore, amount, as Markish maintains, to idle philosophising on Grossman's part. To suggest that Grossman literally endorsed the Pythagorean aphorism would be going too far. Conversely, to dismiss it out of hand, would be to disregard a large body of evidence, in the play and elsewhere, which indicates that cyclical processes are important for Grossman's interpretation of history, and especially war. Markish has also contended that Grossman was criticised, . . . 'совсем не за то, за что стоило и следовало'.³² Furthermore, Markish emphatically rejects any suggestion that Grossman was 'propounding an idealist philosophy hostile to Marxism-Leninism'.³³ Continuing, he insists:

The accusation was utterly groundless, as absurd as accusing him of dealing in narcotics. For an orthodox Marxist-Leninist, as Grossman then was, this made it all the more insulting.³⁴

Two points need to be stressed. Soviet criticism, whatever it felt about characterisation and plot, correctly perceived that the real threat was ideological and philosophical. Grossman's play struck at the very premisses of Soviet progress, its inflated optimism and unreasonable dreams. To those who unhesitatingly believed in the 'planification'³⁵ of time, it was, to paraphrase Mayakovskiy, a slap in the face. Nor can one accept Markish's sleight of hand, the suggestion that Grossman was in 1946 'an orthodox Marxist-Leninist'. Not only does this contradict Markish's own belief that the war marked the turning point in Grossman's relationship towards Soviet power, but it is also very much at odds with what we have seen in earlier chapters and especially in "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam".

Remarkably, Gleb Struve seems to have overlooked the play's real significance:

The play is not devoid of interest, but its "philosophy" is not easily detectable. Its moral seems to be that a good old Liberal of the Tsar's days who swears by Pythagoras is a more valuable individual than a bad Bolshevik who values his material well-being above everything else.³⁶

Marginally more accurate is the view that the play was attacked, . . . 'for its exposure of certain aspects of Soviet life and mentality'.³⁷ No attempt has been made to consider the relevance of the Pythagorean school, and thus why Soviet critics should react in the way in which they did.

It should be noted that Efim Etkind, a scholar thoroughly familiar with Grossman's work, adopts a different approach to both Markish and Struve, and one, which in the opinion of this author, lies much closer to the real nature of "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam". 'В основе пьесы Гроссмана - вопрос, сомнение, ересь'.³⁸ Grossman, he observes, had the temerity to point out to the Soviet people that:

, . . . есть другие философии на свете, кроме Марксизма-Ленинизма! И что теория прогресса не единственная, возможная основа исторического развития!³⁹

The Pythagoreans are not the sole allusion to classical antiquity in the play. Two others can be found, and both are consistent with the subversive themes of the text. In scene VI, during one of his many exegeses on the theme of circular time, Shatovskoy passes the

following comment:

Идут годы, все меняется и ничего не меняется.

Все течет! 40

'Everything flows' which Shatovskoy uses to express the idea of continuity amid change is attributable to the pre-Socratic philosopher Heraclitus of Ephesus ('πάντα ρεῖ or πάντα ῥεεῖ', 'all things are in flux' 41). Both for the play and the later Vse techet its interpretation is significant. At first sight a paradox exists: how can history repeat itself, yet admit continual change or flux? The paradox is resolved by the temporal perspective from which we view change:

Но если проследить это великое течение, то и оно подчинено круговороту. Через тысячелетия земля зацветет или скуют ее морозы, ничто не изменится, вечный круг с вечной мерой порока и добродетели, с вечной мерой горя и слез, этот вечный круг будет совершаться. 42

Shatovskoy accepts the great advances in science or the major geological upheavals. But even if man can change the Earth itself, this is still too narrow a definition of progress. Progress has to be assessed in terms of man's emotional, psychological or moral nature. Only if man advances here can we assert worthwhile progress. The continuing existence of war underlines the point. War is one of the abiding causes of grief and tears, the final eradication of which has persistently eluded mankind. For Heraclitus war served as a metaphor of the continual change, which all Utopias fear.

The third allusion is to the Roman historian Cornelius Tacitus. In scene V of the play Leva reads to Shatovskoy from Tacitus's Annals. This is an apposite association, since the message of the Annals pertains directly to an older generation which experienced the revolution, and to one which now stands on the threshold of The Great Fatherland War.

The dominant archetype in Tacitus is the tyrant; and one of his central themes is tyranny. Both are most forcibly and eloquently expressed through the figure of Tiberius, who occupies the first hexad of the Annals. Tiberius's Rome is characterised by a loss of political and intellectual freedom. Originality and independence of thought, as in Stalin's Russia, are feared. The ubiquitous fear

exerted a disastrous effect on society. Mediocrity and grovelling subservience are rewarded, ability persecuted. In addition, as Stalin was to do, Tiberius manipulated the laws relating to treason - the *Maiestas* Law - to dispose of his political enemies, real or imagined. This resulted in a number of show trials. One of the most famous was that of Libo Drusus, who like Bukharin, Zinoviev and countless others in Stalin's dictatorship, was accused of attempting to overthrow the government. The truly striking parallel between these two sets of trials resides in the dates. Large numbers of trials took place in the thirties A.D., particularly 31-33 A.D., and in 37 A.D. One scholar of Tacitus could easily have been writing about the Stalinist terror, when he stated:

The total effect is of many little known persons, not sharply defined, passing rapidly before us in the ranks of the condemned. 43

A present-day Soviet critic has observed that: 'Ничто не случайно в объемной и точной прозе Гроссмана'. 44 The same could easily be said of "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam".

So closely does Stalin's abuse of power correspond to that of Tiberius', so striking and consistent are the many parallels, that it is difficult to concede the likelihood of mere coincidence. For Grossman, writing in 1941, ancient Rome provided the sharpest and most complete reflected image of the tyranny of his own time. Although post-war research has tended to cast doubt on the portrayal of Tiberius given by Tacitus, 45 Grossman's allusion to Tacitus coheres with the manner in which Tacitus has been interpreted over the centuries, as a code indicating the presence of tyranny. D. R. Dudley has pointed out that Camille Desmoulins uses Tacitus to mirror the Terror of the Jacobins in his *Le Vieux Cordelier*. His comments relate to Tacitus in Grossman's play:

The whole episode is thoroughly Tacitean, and a notable example of how Tacitus is seen to be especially relevant in dark and troubled times. 46

In the words of Milton, Tacitus was 'the greatest possible enemy to tyrants'. 47

Repetition of historical events, which strongly suggests the influence of the Pythagorean interpretation, can be found in a number

of Grossman's wartime sketches. In "Tsaritsyn-Stalingrad" Grossman draws a parallel between the critical situation which existed at Tsaritsyn during the Civil War and that facing the Russians in 1942. On the 23rd August 1918 Voroshilov launched the counter-attack which saved Tsaritsyn from the Whites and Interventionists. Exactly twenty-four years later, on 23rd August 1942, the Germans launched their offensive against Stalingrad:

И словно не было двух десятилетий мирного труда между
временами первой германской оккупации Украины, Дона и
вторым нашествием немцев. 48

Nothing seems to have changed. Of course, as Grossman points out, the comparison is one of event not of scale and ferocity. Massed German air and tank attacks render this a different campaign from that experienced in 1918.

Reporting the reoccupation of the Ukraine by the Red Army in the sketch "Ukraina", Grossman writes:

Мы все переживаем удивительное ощущение « воскрешение
времени » ...мы идем на запад не только в пространстве, но
и в времени. 49

Victory and defeat are inseparably linked. What Grossman calls the 'колесо времени' 50 has been snatched back from the Germans. Echoes of Stalingrad are apparent in "Thoughts on the Spring Offensive" ("Mysli o vesennem nastuplenii"; 1944). Advancing in the atrocious conditions of the rasputitsa, Chuykov's army, the victor of Stalingrad, clashes with the recently reformed German 6th Army:

И случая, а быть может судьбе было угодно, чтобы с новой бой
армией столкнулась сталинградская армия Чуйкова. Тогда,
осенью 1942 года, на Волге 6-я армия бешено наступала,
таранила нашу смертную оборону. Здесь на Днепре, роли
переменялись. 51

Struck no doubt by the strange set of circumstances, Grossman sounds a note of caution, or perhaps overlooks the dangers inhering in the parallel. If the Germans can be defeated when they appear invincible - as at Stalingrad - can a similar fate befall Chuykov's army in 1944?

"Esli verit' pifagoreytsam" was not published until after the war. This has an important bearing on our understanding of the final stages of Grossman's apostasy. In particular one needs to consider why

Grossman did not publish the play during the war. To answer this question, one has to examine the meaning of the war: what did the war mean? In the aftermath of Hitler's invasion, this may appear to be an insensitive and otiose question. Yet, it was precisely this question which helped to shape the post-war expectations of the Russian people. The ideals, which, according to Grossman, had sustained Rodimtsev's men at Stalingrad, are those for which all Russian soldiers fought. The belief that:

...правда и добро побеждают, что дело свободы, дело добра и человечности торжествует над силами мрака, рабства и человеконенавистничества. 52

There is nothing peculiar to Marxist-Leninist thought here. These were the universal values of the anti-Hitler coalition. Literally applied in the Soviet context, they would preclude a return to any form of pre-war repression, and herald a more humane implementation of socialism in one country.

Grossman viewed the war, inter alia, as an opportunity for Russia to expiate the grim memory and experience of the pre-war period. Lipkin records a conversation with Grossman on this theme:

Эта война, по его мнению, смывает всю сталинскую грязь с лица России. Святая кровь этой войны очистила нас от крови невинно раскулаченных, от крови 37 года. 53

For the suffering the war brought, it also offered a sense of freedom and comradeship unknown before 1941. Yet the spirit of independence which it engendered was not tolerated after 1945. The gloom and despair of the thirties had only been temporarily superseded by the desperate struggle for national survival. With the war won and the likelihood of fundamental reform increasingly unlikely, "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam" become a post-war expression of the lost peace. The inclusion of an introductory paragraph for the 1946 publication clarifies Grossman's position:

Ныне, после войны, я вновь перечел пьесу. Как звучат предвоенные мысли в послевоенную пору? Исчезли ли навечно мысли и чувства того, лежавшего перед войной времени? Стоит ли верить пифагорейцам? Легла ли непроходимая грань между тем временем, которое люди называют предвоенным, и тем, которое называется послевоенным? Поразмыслив, я счел, что

во мне нехватит неразумного оптимизма, чтобы назвать эту пьесу целиком и полностью устаревшей, и я решился ее напечатать. 54

One of the main events which illustrated the Pythagorean formulation in 1941 was the war between Britain and Germany. Such a consideration is, however, no longer valid in 1946. The play's renewed relevance is based on something else. This is most likely to be the harsh atmosphere of ideological conformity which suffocated Russia after the war. The renewed constraints represent an obvious parallel with the thirties, and add additional weight to the conclusions, which, it has been claimed, are implicit in Tacitus's Annals. Once again the motif of belief surfaces. During the war Stalin gave numerous indications that after the war life would be better, . . . 'that from the common enterprise of the war a new life would emerge for the Soviet people'. 55 1946 marked the disavowal of this tacit promise. 1946 was, to use Etkind's expression, the year, of 'несбывшихся Больших Ожиданий'. 56 It marked the beginning of a new war:

Одна война окончилась, началась другая. Окончалась народная война против фашизма; началась война своего доморожденного фашизма против народа. 57

II

War and progress mutually interact with one another. War is not only a violent cause of change in the lives of nations, but is itself modified by the changes it causes. Material progress as it is understood in both Marxist and Capitalist societies relies on the advances and increasing sophistication of technology. Inevitably this increases and diversifies the capacity of the industrial nations to wage war. Slaughter, as well as goods and material prosperity, can be mass produced. Technology seemed to promise endless prosperity, the eradication of misery. Instead it became an instrument in the enslavement and murder of millions. Eichmann's crematoria are its ghastliest monument and it is right that Grossman should devote so much of his magnum opus to seeking answers to the terrible questions which they raise. Yet the problem of man and technology, touched upon

in "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam", and examined in the specific context of the Holocaust in "Treblinskiy ad" and Zhizn' i sud'ba, surfaces in other works.

In this respect one of the most important scenes in Narod bessmerten, and certainly the most vividly drawn, is to be found in chapter V, appropriately entitled, 'The Death of a City' ('Смерть города'). The events portrayed in this chapter are based on the German air raid on Gomel, as witnessed by Grossman during the retreat of 1941. While the chapter describes one incident in a huge campaign, it has a much wider relevance.

Grossman views the raid from a number of different perspectives. Dispassionate, he asks questions about those who ordered the raid:

Через сто лет со страхом будут разглядывать историки
спокойно и методически расписанные приказы, идущие из ставки
верховного командования германской армии к командирам
авиационных эскадр и отрядов. Кто писал их? Звери,
сумасшедшие, или делалось это не живыми существами, а
расписывалось железными пальцами арифмометров и
интеграторов? 58

The juxtaposition of beasts, something primitive, with the inanimate imagery of integrators and iron fingers, states the crux of the problem, identified in "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam". Scientific and technological advances have outstripped man's moral development. Weapons of unprecedented power are guided by a brain, which, although capable of prodigious intellectual attainment, also accommodates destructive primeval passions.

Such possibilities contrast sharply with the picture of the German airmen before the raid:

летчики жевали шоколад, покуривали сигареты, писали домой
шутливые короткие открытки, все это были холеные мальчики,
с модной стрижкой. 59

This could be any group of off-duty airmen, Allied or Axis. In the fate of Gomel we see the fate of London, Warsaw and Rotterdam, and for the Germans, the whirlwind which eventually flattened their own cities. Use of organised violence is not confined to the Germans; it is a human characteristic. Equally, smug assertions made in "Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dney" that the Soviet Union is above the

behaviour of the British and Germans (a reference to the period 1939-1940) imply something else:

Весь мир воюет, гремит, а у нас забил нефтяной фонтан,
откопали позвонок динозавра, натолкнулась на стоянку
первобытного человека. 60

Stumbling across his ancestors during the course of industrialisation, man discovers not only the physical remnants of the past, he is also reminded of the primeval legacy to which he is still bound.

Considerable effort is devoted to evoking the city's ancient history, the labours and achievements of its populace. One senses a longing for a bygone age. The city's traditions are impressive; a seat of learning for hundreds of years, a major commercial centre, and the home of many master craftsmen in wood and metal. Grossman's historical perspective records the city for posterity, he creates a portrait of a doomed city immediately before its destruction. Chemical flares illuminate the unsuspecting city. There is something repellent in this artificial illumination, suggested by the oxymoron, 'Мертвый свет спокойно, подробно и внимательно освещал площади города'.⁶¹ Light, the traditional metaphor of life, good and peace, has been perverted. Podrobno and vnimatel'no are adverbs associated with efficiency, in this case with the systematic destruction of the city.

The wanton destruction of this, 'красивый, старинный город на берегу реки'⁶² highlights the helplessness of beauty and art, and the awesome power of modern arms. The continuity of centuries of painstaking endeavour is annihilated in a fraction of the time in which it was created. In the aftermath of the raid we are struck by a number of separate, but related details: a deranged woman with her dead child; the intrusive smell of perfume from a blazing cosmetics shop; and the death throes of a wounded horse. It is this last image which, above all others, commands our attention:

Раненая лошадь лежала на углу улицы. Богарев увидел в ее стеклянневших, но все еще живших глазах отражение пылавшего города. Темный, плачущий, полный муки зрачок лошади, словно кристальное живое зеркало, вобрал в себя пламя горящих домов, дым, клубящийся в воздухе, светящиеся, раскаленные развалины и этот лес тонких, высоких печных труб, который

рос, рос на месте исчезающих в пламени домов. 63

The horse's suffering is a powerful symbol of the indiscriminate violence of war, and the waste it brings. Pain and grief are dumb; yet the silence is accusatory and damning. War is man's invention. Shocked by the violence of the attack, the normally eloquent and omniscient Bogarev is silent. His reaction is strangely at odds with what we have already seen of him:

И внезапно Богарев подумал, что он вообрал в себя

всю ночную гибель мирного старинного города. 64

Like the horse, Bogarev 'imbibes' the destruction of the city. Objectivity is overwhelmed; man, horse and city become fused together. With some justification A. Derman has argued that Bogarev's response is that of Grossman himself:

Эта фраза, как нельзя точнее, применима и к тому, кто ее написал, но в более широком смысле - в смысле отношения автора к войне и всему тому, что она с собой принесла. 65

Symbolically, Bogarev's silence affirms the shortcomings of ideology when confronted with human suffering. Ideology, too, is dumb.

Elements of the schema adopted by Grossman in his description of Gomel's destruction can be seen in his depiction of the first major German air raid on Stalingrad. German preparations are contrasted with the daily routine of the civilian population, as yet ignorant of its fate. As in the bombing of Gomel human beings are not the sole victims in the ensuing conflagration. Nature herself is under attack. Birds, rats and dogs abandon the stricken city. But doves - the symbolic significance is obvious - remain only to perish. Their death is one of the most memorable and effective images of the raid:

Но белые и сизые голуби, силой, еще более могучей, чем инстинкт самохранения, прикованные к своему жилью, кружились над горящими домами и, подхваченные током раскаленного воздуха, гибли в дыму и пламени. 66

In another incident associated with the raid Bogarev comes across the body of an old man, a retired legal expert, killed in the raid:

Возле него валялись порванные, забрызганные кровью книги выпавшие из вынесенной им пачки. Он, видимо, в момент разрыва бомбы приподнялся, выглядывая из неглубокой щели.
« Летописи Тацит », - прочел Богарев название книги,

лежавшей рядом с телом. 67

Blood-spattered and torn, the Annals of Tacitus amid the detritus of modern war, effectively corroborate the Pythagoreans' ideas on time. Nearly two millennia later bitter intestine strife, political terror and wars of aggrandisement still remain the dominant features of inter-statal affairs. As in Tacitus's day, legality counts for nothing; the dead lawyer confirms Cicero's much-quoted dictum that, 'Inter arma silent legis'. Moreover, Tacitus's own views on war are relevant here since they directly challenge the Marxist-Leninist belief that 'Wars are a historically transient phenomenon'.⁶⁸ Struggle, which for Tacitus did not just mean wars, was a permanent characteristic of human societies. As one Tacitean scholar has put it:

He [Tacitus] has learnt to see life as a continual struggle between the powerful, who seek to destroy virtue, and the forces of courage and hope which can be maimed, and in the individual, killed. If this struggle is continual it must in essentials be continually the same. 69

An entry in Grossman's wartime notebooks for 1941 leaves us in no doubt that he, too, finds the same continuity in the Russo-German war. Describing the Russian collapse on the Bryanskiy front, Grossman evokes a striking and magnificent parallel with the Bible:

Исход! Библия! ...это не поток, не река, это медленное движение текущего океана, ширина этого движения сотни метров вправо и влево... Вечером из-за многоярусных синих, черных и серых туч появляется солнце. Лучи его широки, огромны они простираются от неба до земли, как на картинах Доре, изображающих грозные, библейские сцены прихода на землю суровых небесных сил. В этих желтых лучах, движение - старцев, женщин с младенцами на руках, овечьих стад, воинов - кажется настолько величественным и трагичным, что у меня, минутами, создается полная реальность нашего переноса во времена библейских катастроф. 70

Metaphors of water and flowing suggest the Heraclitean apophthegm expressed by Shatovskoy. War appears not as some manifestation of class conflict. It is a periodic cataclysm of ineffable proportions, a divine judgement, before which man cannot but submit.

Questions of moral responsibility and the interrelationship of man and machine were profoundly and irrevocably altered in the aftermath of Nagasaki and Hiroshima. In the short and sombre, yet sadly neglected work, "Avel' - shestoe Avgusta", Grossman examines these questions against the background of the preparations to drop the first atomic bomb, referred to in the story's sub-title. The crew of the bomber receive special attention from Grossman. Highly trained and selected for their individual skills and competence, all are professionals. Technically, they form a team. In the execution of their duties they function in unison, an extension, as it were, of the machine which they fly.

Technology dominates their lives and training. Even death has been reduced to mechanical error:

Смерть летчика для них была низведена в профессиональную вредность... Смерть летчика не была роком, мистическим ударом - она являлась следствием технических и навигационных причин... 71

Having reduced his own death to a 'professional misfortune', the airman insulates himself from the victims of his own bombs. Blek, the co-pilot, whom Grossman describes as the crew's philosopher, states the problem directly:

Знаешь, техника освобождает нас в этом деле от моральной ответственности. Раньше ты разбивал голову врагу и тебя обдавало его мозгом. 72

Sophistication in the means of killing has increased the distance, literally and morally, between the victim and his executioner. Furthermore, the greater the level of sophistication, the more people who are involved. Hitherto, responsibility could be attributed to one individual. With so many involved, responsibility is less easily apportioned, as Blek realises:

Кому нести ответственность? Тот, кто видит врага, - наблюдатель, он не стреляет, а тот, кто стреляет, - огневик, тот не видит, у него только данные - цифры, за что же ему отвечать? Нет, отвечают не те, кто стреляет. 73

Dil, the plane's signaller, applies mathematics to the moral question. He suggests a graph; on one axis the range from the target is plotted, on the other the responsibility. Thus, as the curve tends

to zero moral responsibility becomes, . . . 'бесконечно малой, практически ей можно пренебречь. Обычная вещь при расчетах'.⁷⁴ Dil's fallacy is to equate morality with mathematics. That which may be 'practically ignored', or is a 'usual thing' in calculations, cannot be - but often is - applied to the suffering inflicted by man on his fellow man. Dil's solution is seductive. The graph analogy implies that the greater the distance from the actual killing, the less onerous the question of personal involvement. Reductio ad absurdum, one can only conclude that bombing from high altitude deserves less censure.

It is tempting, as Grossman has hinted at in the way he portrays the technical and professional competence of the crew, to see the crew themselves as an embodiment of the machine, as something inert. In fact there is some basis for this. Barnes, the pilot, who is considered to be one of the finest pilots in the Airforce, is described by Grossman as being deprived of 'нервности и эмоций'.⁷⁵ Similarly, the flight procedures seem to offer no room for human discretion: decisions and actions are determined solely by calculations and instrument panels. Yet the relationship between man and his creation is not as one-sided as it would seem:

Ведь самолет, который управлял поступками людей, страстно выполнявших его волю, мертвый самолет, металл, стекло, пластмасса, возник и летел во тьме по воле человека, послушный, покорный одной лишь этой живой воле.⁷⁶

Volition undermines the fallacy that man is manipulated by the machine. While it is the case that certain technical procedures must be observed in order to fly the plane, it cannot fly without man. The aircraft is a product of man's mind, an extension of himself. Its destructive potential reflects the violent tendencies of man. Morally, the 'dead' aircraft is neutral. The use to which it is put depends entirely on the 'living volition' of man. On a deeper level we may see the crew's submission to the technical procedures of the flight and bombing as man's submission to himself, to the rituals of twentieth-century violence, which instead of the club make use of the four-engined bomber.

Among the crew, Joseph Connor, the bomb aimer, is the odd man out. Age separates him; he is a mere twenty-two years. He possesses, too,

a refreshing naivety which is in marked contrast to the worldliness and cynicism of the other crew members. But Joseph's innocence cannot remain inviolate, given his occupation. Responsible for dropping the bomb, Joseph possesses a terrifying power. For a brief moment he becomes the embodiment of the atomic age: 'Никто - никто не стоял в этот миг рядом с этим мальчиком'.⁷⁷ Yet the power and thus total responsibility are illusory: 'Порвались ли нити, протянутые через океан до этих пальцев?'.⁷⁸ The threads to which Grossman refers link the crew with authority, those who ordered the raid. Grossman's question reminds us that Joseph is a link - albeit a thinking one - in the chain of humanity.

Joseph's hand, the one which the night before had written to his mother, and now becomes instrumental in the extirpation of tens of thousands, fascinates the passenger who accompanies the crew on their mission. Ostensibly there as an official observer and to collect scientific data, the passenger stands in contrast to the professional calm and indifference of the crew. However, he is a witness of another kind, the silent, impotent voice of suffering humanity. Releasing the bomb, Joseph notices the passenger praying. Detached from the crew, he understands the enormity of what is happening, and the implications for mankind. Progress, civilisation and scientific endeavour lose their meaning; they perish alongside the sublimated bodies of the civilian population. Being itself loses all form, 'небо, земля, вода вновь вернулись в хаос...'.⁷⁹ In creating the bomb, man has rejected God's world and wilfully embraced the void of unbeing. Grossman's vision is eschatological:

Так и не победав зла, отцом и сыном которого он является,
человек закрыл книгу Бытия...⁸⁰

Man has conquered the elements, but not himself. The annihilation of Hiroshima is the murder of his fellow man - in a metaphorical sense, his brother, as suggested by the allusion to the story of Cain and Abel in Genesis. Cain is cast out, but redemption is still possible. One doubts whether the same possibility exists for man in the twentieth century; the void is all that he can reasonably expect. Furthermore, if man is both the father and son of evil - the cause and the victim - then he, and not God must take responsibility for its consequences. For Joseph this is manifestly the case. Guilt

overwhelms him, as is suggested perhaps by his frequent hand washing. The other members of the crew seem unable to confront the consequences. Barnes reminds Joseph that they are fighting a war 'co зверем, с фашизмом'.⁸¹ Yet the beast is human and thus found in the hearts of all men. Dil is indifferent to the fate of the Japanese civilians who have perished, and in answer to Joseph's incessant questions and growing anger replies: 'Авель, Авель, где твой брат Каин? 82. Dil misquotes God's question to Cain, casting Abel in the role of murderer. Inadvertently, he supports Joseph's riposte:

Каин обычный паренек, немногим хуже Авеля, и город был полон людей вроде нас. Разница в том, что мы есть, а они были. 83

Here too Dil finds the answer to the riddle, posed by the passenger's prayers: he was praying for mankind. Hence Grossman answers Cain's original question, refuting Blek's belief that they carry no burden of guilt. Man is responsible for his fellow; he is his brother's keeper. It is the agonising and belated acceptance of this which leads Joseph to attempt suicide.

Universal significance is further suggested by the victims. Why, they ask, must they pay for Pearl Harbour and Auschwitz? Reference to Pearl Harbour and Auschwitz underlines the wartime unity of West and East. Hiroshima was not solely an American action; it was also an Allied one. Thus when Grossman writes that politicians, philosophers and publicists did not consider the slaughter of the civilian population or the plight of the survivors at Hiroshima - those who were not responsible for Pearl Harbour or Auschwitz - to be a topical theme, he indicts Soviet indifference as much as Western. No indignant protest was raised by the Soviet Union in 1945. Japan suffered alone. Bocharov's comments on this aspect of the text tend to distort Grossman's meaning. He writes that it is 'bourgeois'⁸⁴ politicians, philosophers and publicists alone who are indifferent to the fate of the innocent. Bocharov's insertion of 'bourgeois' changes Grossman's intended meaning, imputing an anti-Western bias which cannot be found in the original text. Precisely because he wishes to widen his criticism, Grossman eschews such a Soviet cliché. Even more disconcerting, therefore, is the juxtaposition and insidious comparison of the American crew with the Nazis in the death camps.

Hiroshima and Nagasaki were not part of a systematic policy of genocide. The destruction of the two cities was seen (rightly or wrongly) as an ineluctable military measure to bring about Japan's surrender. Both the Holocaust and the bomb are the grim fruits of man's technical ingenuity, but a huge gulf separates the thinking behind the inception of these two cataclysms.

The Biblical allusions and framework in which Grossman sets the story widen its scope still further. "Avel' shestoe avgusta" is not, as Bocharov has suggested,⁸⁵ an exclusively anti-American work. Certainly, Grossman is concerned about the awesome power at the disposal of the Americans, but his critique of the American crew can be applied equally to any state possessing nuclear weapons. Such weapons cannot be used to defend or advance the cause of either Capitalism or Marxism-Leninism. Grossman's conclusions pertain to both systems:

Все почувствовали: средства уничтожения поднялись на такую высоту, что не такой уж фантастической стала казаться перспектива уничтожения человечества ради процветания и величия государств, счастья народов и мира между ними.⁸⁶

It is perhaps worth noting that 1953, the year in which Grossman wrote this work, also saw a major expansion in the Soviet atomic research programme.⁸⁷ At that time the Soviet Union had already exploded its first atomic bomb; the arms race was well under way. "Avel' shestoe Avgusta" reflects the folly of both super powers, who seemed to have learned little from the joint venture of destroying Hitler.

III

Science occupies a fundamental position in relation to war and progress. It provides the knowledge and essential impetus without which the exponential growth in the destructive power of modern war would be impossible and the enticing promises of Utopia unsustainable. Grossman's interest is determined by his professional training and the deep concern for the uses to which the discoveries of scientific research are put by governments. Not surprisingly therefore the scientist is a key figure in Grossman's art, from his early rasskazy

and povesti to Zhizn' i sud'ba and the rasskazy of the sixties. In addition the scientist's changing perception of himself from compliant servant of the state to harsh critic, and eventual heretic, is very much consonant with Grossman's own personal experience.

Much of Grossman's early prose is infused with a boundless optimism in the ability of science to transform man's life for the better. In the introduction to "Glück auf!", his most avowedly conformist work, Grossman explains the significance of the title. It is the standard greeting among the miners of the Ruhr basin, expressing hope for a safe journey to the surface at the end of a shift. In the context of the Donbass such a greeting becomes a metaphor for the aims of industrialisation:

Счастливо подняться! Но подняться не только из шахты.
Счастливо подняться из черных недр самой глубокой шахты
земли - шахты капитализма. Подняться на вершины
материальной культуры. Подняться к обладанию всеми
ценностями науки и искусства. И дальше. Шагнуть на другие,
еще более прекрасные вершины, о которых не смел мечтать ни
один фантазер и безумец. 88

The motif of rising, of triumph over difficulties, is central to the plot. Specialists who have worked for the English owners before the Revolution declare mechanisation of the mine to be unfeasible. However, the party activists represented by the indefatigable Lunin are determined to press ahead despite the apparently insuperable technical problems. This, they do, having enlisted the aid of Reyt, an engineer. Rescued from his aimless existence by Lunin's challenge, Reyt has no doubts as to what is at stake, . . . 'Рождается новая эпоха человечества'. 89 Reyt's sudden conversion lacks verisimilitude, but the belief that the new world was within the grasp of mankind was an accurate enough reflection of the spirit of the times.

Underlying the ethos of scientific endeavour is the assumption that the scientist serves the interests of mankind. In "Glück auf!" this service to man is identified with the communist state, a state which has set itself the goal of freeing man from fruitless labour and enriching his life. In Stepan Kol'chugin, the optimism is muted and the role of the scientist is not exclusively defined in accordance with the interests of the state or its ideology.

For Grossman the scientist's raison d'être is the pursuit of truth. Love of truth, 'которая, прекраснее всего' 90, leads Sergey Kravchenko to embark upon a scientific career. Certain key aspects of Grossman's biography are to be found in Sergey's. Like Grossman, Sergey enters the Faculty of Physics and Mathematics and shares his creator's youthful dreams of making a major breakthrough in the realm of experimental physics, to release the energy of the atom. In the autobiographical fragment "Fosfor" Grossman looks back to this ambition:

Юношей я решил освободить внутриатомную энергию, а еще раньше, мальчишкой, мне хотелось создать в петорте живой белок. Не сбылось. 91

Sergey sees the secret of liberating the energy of the atom as his gift to mankind. That this discovery should embody such potentially catastrophic consequences for mankind, where so much altruism was intended, was undoubtedly a bitter pill; even more so when so much of the initial research on which its outcome depended was due to Einstein, a man and scientist whom Grossman greatly admired. Obliquely, Grossman alludes to this disappointment in "Avel' shestoe Avgusta". After the raid we learn that one of Joseph's boyhood ambitions had been to split the atom.

For all the excitement engendered by the discoveries of Mendeleev modern science depicts a world in which man has increasingly less relevance:

...мир огромен, велик, что история рода человеческого - краткий миг между двумя ледяными валами, что космос бесконечен в пространстве и во времени, что все обречено гибели, что мечта, мысли, чувства, радости и горести людей пусты и бессмысленны в хаосе световых веков, в бесконечности времени. 92

Sergey finds little comfort in these discoveries. Like Levin in Anna Karenina with whom Grossman compares him, he experiences acute anguish. Science seems unable to answer fundamental questions. Reason, the essential tool of all scientific investigation, can provide no solution to death. Sergey suppresses his doubts with the soothing thought that, . . . 'смерти нет, разум - вечен'. 93 Yet he fools himself, as his argument with Bakhmutskiy, an ardent Bolshevik,

shows. He concedes that it will be possible to eradicate starvation, poverty and disease, but this will not satisfy man:

Призраки несчастий, еще более грозных, чем те, которые вы побороли, встанут перед человечеством. Смерть! Во всей своей остроте, не замаскированные материальными несчастьями, выдвинутся проклятые, вечные философские вопросы. Они станут реальной борьбой за хлеб! Встанет страшное противоречие между разумом, всепроникающим, всепознающим, и жалкой временной оболочкой, несущей его! 94

Echoes of Dostoevsky are immediately detectable. Nevertheless Sergey makes a valid point. Sceptical about everything else, scientists often lose sight of, or fail to consider, the wider and deeper issues raised by scientific activity. Bakhmutskiy has no answers to the 'accursed eternal philosophical questions'. Sergey implies clear limits as to what science can achieve: it tells us how, not why. Even more remarkable is the fact that sentiments so manifestly hostile to the aims of Soviet science, and expressed with such convincing eloquence, should be so explicit in a work of literature published before 1941.

Great emphasis is placed on scientific knowledge in the intellectual development of Stepan Kol'chugin. Lacking the privileged background of Sergey, he relies on the help of Aleksey Davydovich. Impressed by Stepan's thirst for knowledge, Davydovich, a chemical analyst - an allusion to Grossman's past - offers to teach him the natural sciences. For the present discussion it is Davydovich's own views which are important. They comprise a contradictory amalgam of conformity and hostility to some of the underlying principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Davydovich is a militant rationalist and rejects all forms of dualism. His faith in science embodies the optimism of the nineteenth century: 'только наука и техника способны двигать прогресс'. 95 Devotion to science and progress is, however, tempered by scathing criticism of political economy and philosophy, which he declares to be 'пустая схоластика', and ... 'ядовитые миражи, болезнь человеческого ума...'. 96 His contempt for philosophy and political economy - the essential plinths of Soviet ideology - stems from the conviction that science must follow paths and ends dictated by itself and not by

ideology. Science should remain unfettered by extraneous considerations. With severely utilitarian aims in mind Davydovich's employer forbids him to pursue research. As an engineer he is a mere functionary, whereas the chemist is a pioneer at the forefront of human knowledge. Forced to work as engineer, Davydovich does not realise his full potential, his skills are debased: 'курица не птица, химик - не инженер'. 97

As is the case with so many of Grossman's heroes, Davydovich's inner world is to be found in his notebooks. They contain the core of his belief regarding science and man's role in the scientific process. Man may penetrate into the bowels of the earth for precious stones and minerals, but according to Davydovich the three most precious stones are not to be found beneath the earth's crust. In the pursuit of ostentation man misses the jewels residing in man himself: 'величие ума, доброта сердца, сила веры'. 98 One detects a certain disdain on Davydovich's part for the mining activities of man, activities consistent with the progress which he purports to uphold:

люди роют глубокие колодцы, бурят песчаник, взрывают
магматические породы динамитом и из каменоломен и шахт
извлекают драгоценные камни. Но есть драгоценности
прекрасней бриллиантов в коронах всех императоров земли. 99

Davydovich illustrates his triad by reference to famous historical figures. He recalls the death of Archimedes, who concerned only to protect his researches, makes no attempt to save his life, and dies at the hands of Roman soldiers, a martyr to truth. Similarly, the heretic Jan Hus refuses to renounce his faith and is burned at the stake. Finally, Galileo, who having renounced the importance of his astronomical discoveries before the Holy Inquisition, nevertheless insists that they are true.

Intended, no doubt, to highlight the repression and obscurantism of Tsarist society, which were real enough, the overall effect is different, and is perhaps indicative of Grossman's aim. Reference to such paradigms of dignity, courage and intellectual vigour widens the historical parameters. Judged from this standpoint, Davydovich's lyrical account becomes an attack on all abuses of power, be they ochlocratic, theocratic or autocratic. The time span invites such a conclusion too. Had Grossman wished his story to refer solely to

Tsarist society, the period in which Stepan Kol'chugin is set, he could easily have found historical characters from the revolutionary underground. But Grossman's examples span the period from classical antiquity through the Middle Ages to the dawn of the European Enlightenment. In other words, the conflict between those who seek truth and those who would suppress it, is a fundamental and perennial characteristic of man's existence. It will not cease to exist when the polarity of Marxism and Capitalism ceases to exist. Davydovich's notebooks contain the early stages of many ideas which receive a fuller expression in Zhizn' i sud'ba. Goodness of heart may be seen as the seed of Ikonnikov-Morzh's testament. Like Jan Hus, Morzh refuses to compromise his beliefs and pays with his life. In addition, the brutality of Imperial Rome and the fear of the truth shown by the Holy Inquisition are inseparable from the odious tyrannies portrayed in Zhizn' i sud'ba.

Unwittingly and inevitably the exploratory proclivities of the research scientist and innovative thinker bring them into conflict with the rigid structures of ideological and religious orthodoxy. Indeed Grossman seems drawn to those figures who provoke the greatest wrath. His writing abounds in the names of those who have asserted interpretations of reality, differing from those of their contemporaries, who have rigorously challenged accepted canons in many disciplines: Luther, Avakkum, Archimedes, Hus, Galileo, Bruno, Newton and Einstein, are names which recur throughout Grossman's work. For Grossman, heresy is a criterion of intellectual excellence and in certain circumstances one of moral superiority.

Significant for this theme are the physicists Dmitry Petrovich Chepyzhin and Viktor Shtrum whose dialogue in Za pravoe delo frequently extends and diversifies well beyond the range of what was acceptable for Soviet scientists. Grossman portrays Chepyzhin as being quite distinct from his fellow Soviet scientists. Personal differences are stressed as much as professional ones. Despite his age Chepyzhin undertakes lengthy trips on foot in remote regions of the Soviet Far East; he keeps a diary dedicated to lyrical digressions and recollections of nature. Equally at home in the practical world, he has built himself a log cabin. Chepyzhin's scientific pursuits reflect the same individual versatility, the harmonious blend of

theory and practice and the same intense curiosity about the world. He is one of the leaders of Soviet physics and a scientist of world renown. An acknowledged expert on the structure of matter, his cosmogonical theories have provoked intense debate among both Western and Soviet theoreticians.

Chepyzhin is a powerful formative influence on Shtrum. Initiated on the basis of common intellectual interests, their relationship develops into one of firm friendship. Not only is Chepyzhin an outstanding thinker, he is also an inspiring teacher, who is guided by Mendeleev's maxim: 'Посев научный взойдет для жатвы народной'.¹⁰⁰ Chepyzhin's individual brilliance and the leading role ascribed to him by Grossman incurred the displeasure of Soviet critics. In the revised edition of Za pravoe delo Chepyzhin's stature is reduced, while Shtrum adopts a more critical stance towards his former teacher. However, it was Chepyzhin's scientific speculation, the fruit of his overlapping interests in philosophy and physics, which formed the focal point for much of the antipathy in the period 1952-53.

Human progress in all its complexity fascinates Chepyzhin, and he seeks to understand what has taken place in Germany. Hitler, he argues, has given free rein to the darker impulses of the human psyche; freedom, reason and good have been forced underground. Chepyzhin develops this idea through the analogy with a town. Those who make the most significant contribution to the welfare of the inhabitants, those who enhance the quality of life, are active in daytime. Others, of whose presence little is known, are active at night; they fear the light. It is the latter category who are prominent in Hitler's Germany. According to Chepyzhin, Hitler's success cannot be seen entirely in the context of economic and social factors. Chepyzhin reduces his analogy to the individual in whom both negative and positive potential coexist:

В человеке намешано всякой всячины, многое в нем под спудом, скрытое, тайное, неверное, часто человек, живущий в нормальных общественных условиях, сам не знает и подвалов своего духа. ¹⁰¹

In time of crisis these sub-conscious drives assert themselves more strongly, breaking through the veneer of civilised society. As Chepyzhin succinctly expresses it: 'Мука князу пошла, а мусор поднялся

наружу'.¹⁰² In fact this idea was first expressed in one of Grossman's wartime works, "Staryy uchitel'". Well before the Germans occupy his village, the old teacher, Rosenthal, realises that the traitors among them have emerged: 'Из подвалов и яров вылезли изменники, слабые духом'.¹⁰³ That Grossman escaped censure during the war for such ideas only to be attacked afterwards tells us much about the changing sensitivities of officialdom.

In Za pravoe delo motifs of surface/consciousness and underground/subconsciousness seem only to refer to the German experience. But the almost identical use of both motifs with regard to Soviet citizens in "Staryy uchitel'" suggests a wider relevance for Chepyzhin's observations. Talking of Hitler's Germany, he has the Soviet Union in mind too, or indeed any society in crisis. In both contexts Chepyzhin employs similar phraseology, since in both, evil arises under similar conditions:

Меняется не соотношение, а положение частей в моральной, духовной структуре человека.¹⁰⁴

Such a conclusion holds out little hope that man will eradicate his evil. But neither will good perish. Suppressed and reviled, it survives even the darkest moments of history. For Chepyzhin the laws of thermodynamics, which assert the indestructibility and immutability of energy, are a ready metaphor for the endurance of good:

Энергия вечна, что бы ни делали для ее уничтожения... и вот такова же духовная энергия народа. И она переходит в скрытое состояние, она рассеивается, но уничтожить ее нельзя. Из скрытого состояния она вновь и вновь собирается в массивное сгустки, излучающие свет и тепло, осмысливает человеческую жизнь.¹⁰⁵

The implications of Chepyzhin's metaphor are obvious to Shtrum, who asks:

...без тьмы немыслимо ощущение света? Вечность добра мыслима лишь в вечности зла?¹⁰⁶

Chepyzhin's speculations on good and evil, and Shtrum's acquiescence drew heavy fire. Notwithstanding the vilification inspired by the Doctors' Plot, Grossman's novel would still, one suspects, have aroused the ire of the Party. Grossman, despite making some concessions to Stalin, in the form of wholesale reproduction of

large parts of Stalin's wartime speeches, was not only repeating, but developing ideas first expressed in "Esl' verit' pifagoreytsam". This did not escape the attention of the critics who took Grossman to task. Bubennov stated that Chepyzhin and Shtrum adhered to the discredited theories of the Pythagoreans:

Идейные пороки романа « За правое дело » не новы, - это рецидивы старых ошибок писателя. Судя по всему, В. Гроссману не удалось еще вырваться из плена порочных « теорий ». 107

Incompatible with the economic aims of the Soviet Union, Grossman's ideas disregarded the wisdom of Stalin:

В то время, когда Коммунистическая партия, товарищ Сталин призывает к изучению объективных экономических законов развития общества, В. Гроссман устами своих героев проповедует внеисторические, реакционные, идеалистические взгляды. 108

Molodoy kommunist endorsed much of Bubennov's remarks, adding:

Писатель даже не делает попыток разоблачать вредные философские бредни своих странствующих по страницам книги горе - « философов ». 109 Chepyzhin and Shtrum were, it concluded, . . . 'вымысел автора, клевета на передовых советских ученых'. 110

Detailed criticisms appeared in Kommunist. Having duly reproached Grossman for the affinities with "Esl' verit' pifagoreytsam", and his failure to draw the appropriate conclusions from earlier critical assessments, A. Lektorskiy goes on to condemn Chepyzhin's philosophy:

Доморошенная философия В. Гроссмана и его главного героя Чепыжина состоит из обрывков идеалистической философии энергетизма, « подсознательного » фрейдизма, мистическо-дуалистической философии извечной борьбы двух неизменных и вечных начал в мире: добра и зла, света и тьмы. 111

In the later version of Za pravoe delo Shtrum vigorously reasserts the orthodox position. Shtrum's counter-arguments seek to reaffirm the primacy of material factors in human history, and especially to rebut any notion of soul or spirit in such a process. Coherent in its perception of the consequences, Shtrum's volte-face is artistically unconvincing. Chepyzhin's ideas, he argues, negate the concept of

progress ('движение вперед').¹¹² Applied to the Soviet system, they predict stagnation (застой), and reject the possibility that man in general can rise to great heights. Of course, in the Gorbachev era zastoy has become a euphemism for the failure of the Brezhnev years. Grossman clearly foresaw the consequences inhering in too narrow a definition of progress. Here are sentiments which are in striking contrast to those expressed with such hope in "Glück auf!"

Despite Shtrum's objections the full thrust of Chepyzhin's arguments are not obliterated. The attacks on Grossman and the subsequent modification of Za pravoe delo have brought about a result not intended (not by the censors). Subversive ideas, hitherto camouflaged and implied, now stand exposed. No deciphering on the part of the reader is required, since greater lucidity has been unwittingly ensured by the pressure on the author. To a certain extent Grossman has managed to turn the tables on the censors.

Grossman's 'spiritual energy' was not only ridiculed for its association with Freud and the human subconsciousness. Lektorskiy imputed a Biblical meaning:

Эта таинственная « скрытая » энергия, освобожденная от
своего материального носителя, витает над материей, как
« дух Божий носился над водой ». ¹¹³

Biblical associations are not as far-fetched as they might seem. In Chepyzhin's cosmogony the boundaries between energy, as it is understood in purely physical terms, on the one hand, and spirituality, good and evil on the other are blurred. Eventually they disappear, and one is left with something that transcends the laws of matter, yet at the same time is very much part of them. The corollary of this, Lektorskiy concludes, is:

...извечная противоположность духа и массы - материи,
отдельных исключительных личностей и массы
посредственностей. Иначе говоря, перед нами старая, лишь
немного подновленная и завуалированная идеалистическая
теория « героев и толпы ». ¹¹⁴

Lektorskiy's remarks are not entirely without substance. Grossman attaches little importance to class factors, as is apparent from Chepyzhin's biography. Individuality, intellectual independence, and a deeply personal relationship with the world of nature all militate

against the contention that it is the 'совокупность общественных отношений' 115 which is responsible for man's inner world. An article in Zvezda continued the attack on what was considered to be Grossman's espousal of élitism:

Принижение народа до толпы - есть выражение недоверия к народу, к его силам, инициативе и уму, что является серьезнейшим недостатком нового романа В. Гроссмана. 116

Exactly why Grossman's use of tolpa should be perjorative, and the Marxist term masses should not, is not clear. Nor, given Grossman's Stalingrad sketches, quite apart from the many vivid portraits of soldiers and civilians in Za pravoe delo, can one take seriously the accusation that Grossman had no faith in the people. In fact, it is clear that Chepyzhin closely identifies the ethos of his scientific research with the people, something which Soviet critics have disregarded. Interestingly enough, when Chepyzhin and Shtrum discussed the causes of Fascism, the socialist tradition of Germany is acknowledged:

Миллионы прогрессивных, гуманных людей, воспитанных на идеях Маркса, Энгельса, Бебеля, Розы Люксембург, Либкнехта, Тельмана... 117

In the book version references to Marx et al have been erased and socialist is dropped in connection with the workers' movement in Germany. Both the extreme left and right staked a claim to socialism and this deletion reflects Soviet discomfort over this apparent common ground. The larger deletion makes sense in the context of Chepyzhin's thesis and the opposition to it. Notwithstanding the supposedly enlightening influences of Marxist ideas, Hitler was still able to gain political ascendancy. Concepts of hope and freedom inherent in words such as 'progressive' and 'humane' were simply brushed aside. Partly, this explains Lektorskiy's conclusion:

Ведь если верить рассуждениям Чепыжина - В. Гроссмана, то фашизм, гитлеризм - это порождение немцев « вообще » или, как выражается автор презрительно « жизненной квашни », а не порождение немецких империалистов, банкиров и помещиков, не их кровавая террористическая диктатура над немецким народом. 118

Predicated on the basis of class, Lektorskiy's objections clearly

anticipated the stance to be adopted by Malinovskiy and Epishev when the campaign against the Remarquist writers was at its height.

Controversy surrounding Chepyzhin did not confine itself to his non-class interpretation of history. His views on the evolution of human knowledge were equally unorthodox. According to Chepyzhin there are three phases in the development of human societies and their acquisition of knowledge. The first is the intermolecular period. Here we find the 'первобытный младенец' 119, who is only able to affect the form and location of objects in his environment. To the second era belongs man's discovery of chemistry, the discovery of fire and the ability to work metal. Ultimately this leads to the industrial revolution. The final era, and the one, according to Chepyzhin, on whose threshold mankind now stands, is the nuclear age. At its most fundamental level human civilisation may be expressed in terms of atomic physics. In the words of Chepyzhin:

Вся история культуры может быть сведена к движению

человеческой мысли от внешнего кольца электронов к ядру. 120

Historical inevitability is difficult to find. The path from primeval man to the discoveries of Rutherford and Planck does not conform to the putative laws of dialectical materialism. It is due to man's intensely inquisitive mind and the workings of chance. As in "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam", doubt is thus cast upon the claims of Marxist-Leninist teleology. However, the theory of tsichlichnost' has been modified. Progress is haphazard and erratic; prediction is impossible. The goal of mankind - if it exists - cannot be deduced, since history is fraught with uncertainties.

Chepyzhin's temporal perspective is important too. He cogitates upon the nature of human progress in terms of a million years. Based on such a scale his arguments are more convincing than the narrow parameters in which Marxist philosophy envisages change. Indeed, judged from a such a perspective Marxist philosophy appears almost irrelevant, merely an important stage in the evolution of man's political consciousness, but one which will be superseded. Chepyzhin's account of historical change does not invoke the likelihood of stagnation: Soviet Marxism itself does. By arrogating to itself the right to be the sole repository of truth, discovered or undiscovered, and enforcing this right where necessary by the threat

or use of violence, Soviet Marxism impedes intellectual development. Hence Chepyzhin stresses the mutual aims of scientific research and those of the war:

В грозную, страшную пору отечества во всей глубине видишь, какие могучие, кровные, душевные связи объединяют науку с жизнью народа... Путь науки к ядру атома, путь к внешнему электронному кольцу - это лишь выражение тех вечных и главных связей, без которых не может существовать истинная наука. И я верю, что наша работа сливается с военной борьбой. 121

Far from being esoteric self-indulgence, as Soviet critics have suggested, Chepyzhin's research, and the intellectual freedom to pursue it, are inextricably bound up with the freedom for which the Soviet people are waging war. Science must be unfettered by ideology if it is to serve the higher interests of mankind.

Very little concerning the campaign against Grossman seems to have been published in the West at the time. However, in one article published in the émigré journal Grani, N. Anatoleva did attempt to examine the significance of what was taking place and provides some valuable insights into the thinking behind the vilification. She suggests that the three phases of human history were developed by the seventeenth-century philosopher Giovanni Vico 122, and that their origins may be traced back to the Heraclitean theory of evolution. Thus, Chepyzhin's ideas have a respectable pedigree and merit serious attention. They belong to a much older and wider tradition than Marxism-Leninism. Such theories, she argues, terrify Soviet ideologists, and would account for the hostility directed at Grossman. Criticism of the philosophy of energetics may be seen as an oblique attack on related ideas prevalent among Western scientists. Experiments carried out by Meier, Joule, Koldit and Ostwald demand an explanation for the Marxist-Leninist claim that matter is self-propelled. According to Anatoleva this accounts for Chepyzhin's interest in energetics:

...он как физик ищет объяснения философских постулатов, а не удовлетворяется во всем марксистской догмой о самодвижущейся материи. 123

Interest in this field was not peculiar to Chepyzhin. There was

widespread interest among Soviet scientists. Concerned about this state of affairs, the Party published an article in the journal Bolshevik in which it sought to rebut the arguments.¹²⁴ The attacks on Grossman served a dual function. They were a warning to writers at large not to indulge in dangerous speculation. In this respect, as Anatoleva quite rightly asserts, Grossman was by far the worst offender:

Но в наибольшей « ереси » обвиняется Василий Гроссман.

Он посягнул на « святое святых » коммунистической партии - на ее философию, претендующую на роль непогрешимой, непреложной, верховной мудрости.¹²⁵

Such attacks also permitted the party theorists to discredit ideas which had become unacceptably popular. The dangers posed by these ideas may be deduced from Krymov's comments on Chepyzhin which were part of the book version. Krymov concedes Chepyzhin's outstanding abilities as a scientist, but considers his intellectual peregrinations inadmissible:

...но там, где он отходит от своих работ по физике и пытается философствовать, он, случается, противоречит самому себе как физику, не разбирается в марксистской диалектике.¹²⁶

Shtrum still expresses faith in Chepyzhin, pointing out to Krymov that perhaps it is knowledge itself rather than the theory of knowledge which is more important. Unconvincingly, Krymov is allowed the final word on this score, in essence repeating the comments of Lektorskiy. Vague and unsatisfactory, the answer fails to address Shtrum's point.

Chepyzhin's views are threatening precisely because they are not confined to the realms of physics. Moreover, as a scientist researching the mysteries of the sub-atomic world, Chepyzhin is clearly more competent to pass judgement on the implications of his discoveries than Krymov, if for no other reason than that he understands them, whereas Krymov does not. Chepyzhin understands that knowledge cannot be compartmentalised. It is this awareness which leads him beyond his own discipline in search of a broader, unified view of the universe. Of course Marxism-Leninism claims to do exactly this, and in accordance with the strictest scientific rigour. But the open hostility which its adherents manifest towards Chepyzhin's ideas

suggests that scientists, while indispensable for realising the plans of Soviet power, represent the most serious challenge to the intellectual hegemony of Marxism-Leninism. The tribulations of Andrey Sakharov, Yuriy Orlov, Zhores Medvedev and Leonid Plyushch, to name a few from a long and honourable list, bear witness to the friction between scientist and state in the Soviet Union.

Science and ideology are at loggerheads in Zhizn' i sud'ba. At the heart of the conflict lie the discoveries and theories of Albert Einstein. Grossman's admiration of Einstein is shared by Shtrum. To the annoyance of his superiors, the administrators of his institute, Shtrum links the tenacity and courage of the Stalingradtsy with qualities in Newton and Einstein, the two great founders of modern science:

Мне кажется, что упорство наше в Сталинграде - это упорство Ньютона, упорство Эйнштейна, что победа на Волге знаменует торжество идей Эйнштейна. 127

Likewise, Shtrum constructs an analogy between physics, the main thrust of science in the twentieth century, and Stalingrad, which in 1942 had become, . . . 'направлением главного удара для всех фронтов мировой войны'. 128 Shtrum's analogy in Zhizn' i sud'ba has much in common with Chepyzhin's view, expressed in the journal version of Za pravoe delo, that strong spiritual ties unite science and the people in the midst of war. Here, Grossman's language is significant. It is surely no coincidence that the sentiments linking the aspirations of a physicist craving the freedom to research, and those of a people desperate to rid themselves of Nazi and Soviet tyranny allude to the title of Grossman's most powerful Stalingrad sketch, "Napravlenie glavnogo udara". One may conclude perhaps that Grossman repudiates the critical stance adopted by Shtrum in the revised text of Za pravoe delo towards Chepyzhin's ideas. 129

Party hostility towards Einstein is prompted by xenophobia and above all by the implications of Relativity Theory. Einstein destroyed the concept of absolute space and time. After Einstein comforting certainties disintegrated:

Мир стал неевклидовым, его геометрическая природа формировалась массами и их скоростями. 130

Notwithstanding the anti-Semitic overtones the dangers posed by

Einstein's theories were clear to certain members of the Soviet establishment. Heavily influenced by Einstein, Shtrum's researches attract the displeasure of the 'scientific section of the Party's Central Committee, because, . . . 'они противоречат материалистическим представлениям о природе вещества'.¹³¹ Shishakov, a party functionary, demands that Shtrum publicly renounce his support for Relativity Theory. Cast in the role of a modern Galileo, Shtrum rejects the right of ideologists to make definitive judgements on the nature of physical reality, and thus he also rejects Lenin's well known praktitsizm or practicalness:

..., логика математических выводов сильнее, чем
логика Энгельса и Ленина.¹³²

Under intense pressure to declare his 'Talmudic abstractions' invalid, Shtrum, unlike Galileo, stands firm. Eventually the Party becomes aware of the practical applications, particularly in the field of atomic weapons, and the campaign against Shtrum ceases. That the inconsistencies between Leninist theory and the consequences of Einsteinian mechanics could be so easily discarded amply corroborates the cynical attitude of the Party towards its own ideology. Confronted with unacceptable discoveries - as argued in the Pythagorean analogy - the Party suppresses them; yet where practical benefits may accrue from a new idea, inconvenient ideology can be set aside. As Hannah Arendt has suggested:

It is this freedom from the content of their own ideology
which characterises the highest rank of the totalitarian
hierarchy.¹³³

IV

Precise scientific laws governing the progress of human societies have yet to be found; nothing in Grossman's writing suggests that they will be. In Grossman war, like progress, defies accurate prescription and prediction and Grossman's study consistently challenges orthodox Soviet assumptions on the nature of war. Much of this theme in Grossman may be seen as a dialogue with Tolstoy. In this final section, therefore, an attempt will be made to compare and contrast the two authors' approaches to war.

Notwithstanding the massive technological advances which have been

made in the prosecution of war since 1812, the questions examined by Tolstoy have lost none of their relevance, and may still be legitimately investigated in the context of 1941-45. What is war? How valid is the concept of the just war? Can, or should, war be defined through international treaty? Is war governed by laws? What can Grossman add to the debate concerning the great man theory, a debate, initiated by Tolstoy in Voyna i mir, and pursued with relentless vigour? It is at this level, at what one might term the deep structure of war, that a comparative analysis of Tolstoy and Grossman is most rewarding.

A successor to Tolstoy in the field of war literature has been actively sought by certain Soviet critics since the end of the war. Twenty years on in 1965 I. Kuz'michev bemoaned the absence of the definitive chronicle of the nation's agony:

Мы все еще не имеем своей « Войны и мира », той главной

книги, которая рассказала бы нам « всю правду » о войне. 134

Yet not all agreed. In a sharply worded reply in Znamya A. Bocharov described Kuz'michev's article, . . . 'как печальный анахронизм, как рецидив проработочной критики'. 135 Specifically attacking the notion of the 'main book', he added:

Тезис о « главной книги » не имеет, конечно, ничего общего с реальным развитием литературы, которая существует не для одноразового выявления « сущности », а для полного, правдивого и бесконечно многообразного отображения действительности. 136

Bocharov's sensitivity is unusual. With the passage of time the demand among Soviet writers and critics for the 'main book' has not diminished. In 1985 many writers still expressed the hope of seeing the new Voyna i mir. 137 Grigory Baklanov, whose contribution to Soviet war literature is considerable, unreservedly affirms the significance of Tolstoy for Soviet writers:

Все самое значительное, что создано в советской литературе о войне гражданской, первой мировой, Отечественной - все это опиралось на толстовскую традицию. 138

Baklanov would seem to suggest that Tolstoy's significance is more than an influential tradition. His writing - and it is worth emphasising that Baklanov does not confine himself to Voyna i mir -

creates a set of criteria, according to which all Soviet writers with pretensions to having made a serious contribution to Soviet war literature, should be judged.

Elements of the Tolstoyan tradition are immediately obvious in Grossman's prose and in his experience. In both Za pravoe delo and Zhizn' i sud'ba he offers us a broad panorama of a nation at war. A powerful, seemingly unstoppable enemy comes to grief. Russian nationalism was as decisive in Hitler's demise as it was in the frustration of Napoleon's dreams. Grossman, although nominally a non-combatant, actively sought out, and shared the dangers and privations of those about whom he wrote. Knowledge of war at the 'sharp end' is an essential feature of Grossman's realism. The initial reception given to Za pravoe delo implied a comparison with Voyna i mir. Two reviews 139 of the novel, one in Molodoy kommunist, the other in Ogonyok, referred to it as an epic. Both reviewers praised Grossman's comprehensive depiction of the war and the, . . . 'сила большого реалистического искусства'. 140

Details of still more encouraging assessments are provided by N. Anatoleva:

Известный критик Н. Толченова не только сравнивала роман с « Войной и миром » Толстого, но и откровенно сказала, что ее потрясли многие страницы и эпизоды романа. Г. Бровман прямо сказал, что « Гроссман может одной строчкой дать больше, чем некоторые братья-писатели на многих страницах ». Л. Субоцкий справедливо назвал роман « панарамой нашей войны ». А. Авдеенко пошел еще дальше - он не только оценил произведение Гроссмана, но, сравнивая его с романом К. Симонова « Товарищи по оружию », сказал, что Симонову « невыгодно, что в № 10 журнала печатаются эти два романа ». 141

Comparisons with Tolstoy - a positive assessment of Grossman's work - were soon overshadowed. Bubennov attacked those in the Union of Writers who regarded Za pravoe delo as the, 'советская « Война и мир », or an, '« энциклопедия советской жизни »'. 142

On the question of a successor to Voyna i mir, Konstantin Simonov is unequivocal: the demands to create the new Voyna i mir are, he asserts, impossible to implement because, ' . . . книги, подобные « Войне

и миру », дважды не создаются'.¹⁴³ Simonov was well acquainted with attacks on Grossman in 1952-53, and clearly does not endorse the claims made on behalf of Za pravoe delo, as recorded by Anatoleva. Whether Simonov read Zhizn' i sud'ba is not known. In any case, in 1969, at a time when the existence of Zhizn' i sud'ba was not acknowledged, Simonov would not have been able to compare the two authors. Personal rivalries and ideological considerations to one side, Simonov's remarks deserve attention.

Naturally, the exact conditions which pertained to 1812, and in particular to the genesis of Voyna i mir itself, cannot be duplicated, but similarities - podobnyy is also Simonov's word - as opposed to exact congruencies, surely can be. Support for this view is adduced by Simonov himself. During the Russo-German war, . . . 'роман « Война и мир » прожил в нашем сознании как бы вторую жизнь'.¹⁴⁴ That Voyna i mir should strike such a deep chord in the Russian psyche is not surprising. In the winter of 1941 with Guderian's armoured columns at the gates of Moscow, Voyna i mir seemed profoundly relevant, as Simonov confirms:

чтение « Войны и мира » в тот период нашей жизни стало навсегда запомнившимся потрясением, не только эстетическим, но и нравственным.¹⁴⁵

Given this sense of catastrophe which exists in both periods, it appears that conditions are inherently conducive to the creation of the 'new Voyna i mir'.

Later critics, most notably Bocharov, have also made the comparison with Tolstoy. The origins of Bocharov's volte-face need not concern us here, but the basis for the comparison is certainly relevant. Apart from the pivotal role played by families in both works, the Rostovs in Tolstoy, the Shaposhnikovs in Grossman, Bocharov recognises the importance of philosophical and authorial digressions for Grossman: 'если бы не было этих рассуждений, не было и описаний'.¹⁴⁶

Of course many aspects of the Tolstoyan tradition can be found in the work of other Soviet writers. Sholokhov, Okudzhava, Baklanov, Nekrasov, Bykov - to name but a few - are as much the heirs and exponents of the Tolstoyan legacy as Grossman. Of these Sholokhov would seem to enjoy the strongest claim. Yet the philosophical speculation, the restless spirit of enquiry, which inform Voyna i mir,

are absent. To quote Ermolaev:

Unlike Tolstoy, Sholokhov does not search for the laws of history, or explore in depth the question of individual freedom and historical necessity, or probe into the meaning of human existence in a religious context. 147

Bykov and Baklanov, and to a lesser extent, Okudzhava and Nekrasov, analyse in great depth the extreme psychological states which occur in war. Based on the 'localised principle' ('локальный принцип' 148), the works of Bykov and Baklanov do not lend themselves to the wider historical perspective. Similarly, the approach of Nekrasov and Okudzhava generally militates against a philosophical understanding of war. Only in Grossman do we find a writer who embraces the thematic heterogeneity of okopnaya pravda with Tolstoy's unremitting quest for meaning in the historical process. As Lipkin puts it:

Гроссман развернул панораму одной из величайших битв, и развернул ее не только сверху, как бы с вертолета, когда наглядны все фронты, армии, корпуса, дивизии. Он увидел битву и снизу, глазами солдата в окопе. До него только Толстой таким двойным зрением увидел войну. 149

One facet of the critical response to the publication of Zhizn' i sud'ba in the Soviet Union strongly suggests that the wait for the 'main book' is now over. A large number of critics have explicitly compared Grossman's achievement to that of Tolstoy's in Voyna i mir. In the first of a series of articles in Oktyabr', Bocharov argues that Grossman's two novels are the closest to, . . . 'той русской эпической традиции, которая была утверждена Л. Толстым в « Войне и мир »'. 150 Others, while recognising the parallels, sound a note of caution, even scepticism. L. Anninskiy in Druzhba narodov has drawn attention to what he believes are important differences:

Говорят: много Толстовского. Но схожесть Гроссмана с Толстым слишком видна, чтобы быть такой простой, как кажется. Ключевой толстовский ход: в то время, когда - у Гроссмана отсутствует. Толстой сплетает и связывает, а Гроссман стыкует и сталкивает. 151

V. Kulish and V. Oskotskiy, an historian and literary critic respectively (a combination of disciplines which reflects Grossman's historiographical as well as his literary importance) provide what is

to date the longest and most detailed analysis of Zhizn' i sud'ba published in the Soviet Union. They dismiss the prize-winning novels of the seventies, such as Stadnyuk's Voyna and Chakovskiy's Blockade (Blokada; 1968-75), unhesitatingly ascribing Tolstoyan grandeur and profundity to Zhizn' i sud'ba. But they qualify their observations:

соотносить - не значит отождествлять или уравнивать,
проводить прямые, буквальные аналогии, выискивая среди
героев Василия Гроссмана Андрея Болконского, Пьера
Безухова. 152

This is a prudent comment, and while a study of the parallelism in characterization between Zhizn' i sud'ba and Voyna i mir is not excluded, caution needs to be exercised.

Tolstoy was of immense importance for Grossman. In his wartime notebooks, Grossman recalls his visit to Yasnaya polyana after the Germans had been ejected. Earlier visits in peace time had left him unmoved, but now in the midst of war, Tolstoy acquires a deeper, more emotional appeal, as he did for many other people:

И вот сейчас я почувствовал совсем по-иному, что это не музей, а живой дом, что горе, вьюга, распахнувшая все двери в России, выгоняющая людей из обжитых домов на черные осенние дороги, судьба не щадящая ни мирной городской квартиры[...], что судьба эта не поминала и дом Толстого. [...]это горе, вырвавшееся в дом, сделано его сущим, живым, страдающим среди миллионов таких же сущих, живых страдающих домов. 153

Tolstoy's significance for Grossman does not recede after the war and in Zhizn' i sud'ba Tolstoy is never far away. Grossman's purpose is not difficult to discern. References to the Sevastopol'skie rasskazy, Voyna i mir, Kazaki and Khadzhi murat are one way of acknowledging not only the force of the Tolstoyan tradition, to which Grossman belongs, but also his personal and artistic debt to the great master.

Unlike Tolstoy who ridicules the notion of the 'теоретики войны' 154 or that of the 'ученые военные' 153, Grossman attaches some importance to such ideas, both in earlier works and in Zhizn' i sud'ba, though with some important modifications in the later work. In earlier works the techniques of tactical analysis are identified with those used by the scientist. The military planner attempts to synthesize a plethora

of data, often seemingly unrelated. In Narod bessmertn Mertsalov reflects upon this process as he considers the enemy's intentions:

Он увидел, как отдельные слогаемые, накладываясь одно на другое, лишь существовали механически...

...Мозг его воссоздал в динамической проекции все многочисленные составляющие этого сложного боя. 156

Mertsalov's mental efforts are those of the research scientist, who seeks a coherent and unified solution:

Так ученый математик или физик в первой стадии исследования бывает подавлен сложностью и противоречивой тяжестью элементов, которые открывает он во внешне-простом и обычном явлении. Ученый с великим напряжением соединяет, пытается провести во взаимосвязь эти рассыпающиеся, противоречащие друг другу слогаемые... Этот процесс называется творчеством. И нечто подобное переживал Мерцалов, решая сложную, возникшую перед ним задачу. 157

Creation (tvorchestvo) is a recurring theme in Grossman's wartime writing. Military planning is akin to the work of the artist as well as the scientist. Intuition and inspiration supplement rational analysis:

Война - искусство. В нем дружат элементы расчета, холодного знания и умного опыта с вдохновением, случаем и чем-то совсем иррациональным... Дружат, дружат, а иногда и враждуют. Это как музыкальная импровизация, которая немислима без гениальной техники. 158

With regard to successful military planning, rational analysis and inspiration are inseparable. In the ocherk "The Creation of Victory" ("Tvorchestvo pobedy"; 1944) Grossman reconsiders the whole question in the light of impending victory. An important ingredient of Soviet military success was the better Soviet commander's renunciation of the 'канонизирование приемов успехов'. 159 There is an unmistakable element of paradox:

Кратчайшим расстоянием до границ « европейской крепости » оказалась не та геометрическая прямая линия, которую видели на карте немцы, а совсем иная, великолепная и сложная кривая, рожденная аналитической геометрией войны... 160

Soviet military thought, or at least some of its more adventurous

practitioners, has imbibed the lessons of its German adversary. Better still, it has transcended its mentor and taken the theory and practice to a new pitch of excellence. Soviet achievement in military science is analogous to the revolutionary concepts of Lobachevskiy and Poincaré in geometry. Euclidean assumptions that the shortest distance between two points is a straight line are rejected in favour of the 'magnificent and complex curve' (Zamyatin immediately comes to mind 161). Soviet success defies conventional analysis. Consider too the formula 'the curve born of the analytical geometry of war'. Birth suggests the pain and difficulty of creation through experience, whereas the analytical process highlights the difficulties posed by multifarious data. Creation and analysis embody an holistic approach which has triumphed over the reductionism of the Germans.

Grossman's use of tvorchestvo to embrace the activity of scientist and artist is remarkably similar to that of Spengler. In his discussion of mathematics Spengler argues that the word schöpferisch - the exact German translation of tvorcheskiy - pertains to mathematical enquiry. Newton, Gauß and Riemen were, according to Spengler, 'künstlerische Naturen'.¹⁶² Furthermore, Grossman's use of analytical geometry as a metaphor of the new fluidity in Soviet military thought coheres with Spengler's view concerning its impact on human thought: 'Die analytisch gewordene Geometrie löste alle konkrete Formen auf'.¹⁶³ Whether this amounts to a direct borrowing from Spengler on Grossman's part cannot be stated with absolute certainty. Grossman was no stranger to advanced mathematics. Yet what is striking is not that both authors should use identical terms, but rather the context in which they are used. The same is true of Grossman's tvorchestvo motif.

Several publications of "Tvorchestvo pobedy" exist in various collections of Grossman's povesti and rasskazy. An important deletion can be found in those versions published after 1956. In the wartime version and that published immediately after the war in The War Years (Gody voyny; 1946) Grossman concludes his analysis of Soviet victory with the following paragraph:

Это творчество, ищущее высших, более совершенных форм,
никогда не удовлетворяющееся сегодняшним, пытливо и остро
смотрящее в будущее, творчество, вдохновленное сталинской

стратегией и объединенное сталинской волей, - и есть залог победы! 164

In subsequent versions of "Tvorchestvo pobedy" brought out by the military publishing house Voenizdat 165 references to Stalin as the architect of victory have been erased. The removal of Stalin's name from this particular ocherk, and in the given context, is significant. It was almost certainly due to the military's attempt, inspired partly no doubt by Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin in 1956, to restore the prestige and professional autonomy of the Army.

In the euphoria of approaching victory Grossman's panegyric to Stalin's military genius is not quite as unusual as it seems. The whole tone of Grossman's later wartime reportage is characterised by hope and reconciliation. Faith in Stalin's promises for a better Russia after the war had not yet been shattered and goodwill towards Stalin was widespread. Praise of Stalin would have been consistent with the general spirit of optimism. As far as this author is aware, it is the only example of such praise anywhere in Grossman's oeuvre.

Yet this praise of officially recognised Soviet strategy and of Stalin in particular merits closer attention. It implies some criticism. 'Canonisation of the methods of success', of which the Germans stand accused, was unquestionably a feature of Soviet military thought as well, and one which had far more in common with Euclidean rigidity or Phuel's dogma in Voyna i mir than with the innovative and pioneering ethos of Lobashevskiy and Poincaré. Only when enterprising individuals were able to divest themselves of its negative and stifling authority were they able to compete with the German generals as equals in the realms of tactics and at the strategic-operational level. Stalin's contribution to strategy was formalised in the so-called 'permanently operating factors:' the strength of the rear; number of arms and divisions; their quality and quantity; and organisational support.¹⁶⁶ Absent from this list is the factor of surprise. In the aftermath of the German invasion this had been downgraded;¹⁶⁷ for obvious reasons. To concede the importance of surprise as a major factor in war - universally accepted then and now - would have been an admission of negligence.

Grossman's wartime sketches attest the importance of surprise in military operations. In the battle for the Kursk salient it was

paramount:

Еще одной исключительно важной особенностью июльских боев 1943 года является отсутствие элемента внезапности. В этом нынешнее наступление немцев диаметрально противоположено наступлению, начатому 22 июня 1941 года. 168

Similarly in "Bobruyskiy kotel" we find the following:

Успех немецкого наступления в июне 1941 года был в значительной степени определен вероломной, бандитской внезапностью. 169

Grossman's use of verolomnyy, a key term in Stalin's belated address of 3rd July 1941, exposes the 'verolomnoe voennoe napadenie' as a crude euphemism for a surprise attack. Thus Grossman's praise of Stalin's military genius must be seen as superficial and confined to the atmosphere prevailing when the Soviet Union was on the threshold of victory. Arguably praise may be seen as a sarcastic comment, suggesting that the Soviet Union defeated the Germans in spite of, and not thanks to, Stalinist strategy.

Strategy and the question of military genius are two interrelated themes in Grossman's analysis of the Stalingrad battle in Zhizn' i sud'ba. Here the parallels with Voyna i mir are compelling. Central to this discourse are Tolstoy's assault on the 'great man theory' and the concomitant search for coherence in the mechanism of war. Tolstoy adduces four main arguments against the great man of history, the ethos of which is personified by the military commander Napoleon. These arguments are well known and may be summarised as follows. Firstly, it is impossible for any one individual, however gifted, to enjoy total control over historical events. Secondly, if the lower and intermediate levels of command fail to execute specific aspects of the military operation, genius counts for nothing. Thirdly, the military commander is never solely responsible for the initiation of an event or battle. To see him as being so is, Tolstoy assures us, a solecism, albeit an understandable one, since our conceptual apparatus finds it difficult to accommodate 'абсолютная непрерывность движения'. 170 It therefore selects an arbitrary starting point from which to consider a given event. Finally, Tolstoy warns us to be beware of the fallacy, post hoc, ergo propter hoc: conquerors may always be present in war, but it does not mean that they are the cause

of wars, or that they express the alleged laws of history.

Tolstoy expounds his thesis with a mixture of artistic flair, intellectual ruthlessness, and a zeal which at times borders on mania. During a Russian council of war eight different solutions are advocated to defeat Napoleon. Some of those present are ill-equipped to pass judgements; they are opportunists, who adhere to one of the various factions according to its current popularity or social standing. Far more important are the opinions of General Pfuel (1779-1866), a Prussian staff officer, whose theories Tolstoy considers at some length. Pfuel bases his tactical and strategic plans on the assumption that military strategy is a precise science which derives its validity from 'неизменные законы'.¹⁷¹ New developments in military thinking are not incorporated, and wars which do not conform to theory cannot be regarded as real wars. Theory is paramount, an end in itself - and this view carries with it disastrous consequences. Pfuel blames the defeats at Jena and Auerstadt on those who failed to heed the precepts of theory. At no stage does he call his theories into question. Present at the discussion of future plans, Prince Andrey appreciates the flaws inherent in an all-embracing theory:

Какая же могла быть теория и наука в деле, которого условия
и обстоятельства неизвестны и не могут быть определены, в
котором сила деятелей войны еще менее может быть
определена? 172

No less flawed is the figure of the omniscient military commander. One example will illustrate the point. During the preliminary stages of the Battle of Schöngraben, the low ground where the battle takes place is enveloped in dense mist. Napoleon and his senior commanders are above the mist on a hilltop in bright sunlight. Unable to see the battle, Napoleon cannot know how it is progressing. Neither can he make informed decisions, again for the same reason. By the time the mist clears the battle is well under way. Thus Napoleon effectively enters the fray at a stage when events have taken a course not determined by him. Tolstoy's clock analogy underlines Napoleon's superficial knowledge of the battle. The movements which take place on the face of a clock are due to the thousands of unseen operations of the clock's mechanism. So it is with a battle. Apparent simplicity misleads. We see the totality of complexities, the course

of the battle - the hands moving on the face of the clock - but the underlying ones, the reasons for this interaction, remain beyond our grasp. The point is reinforced before the Battle of Borodino. Napoleon, in conversation with a senior commander, maintains that the human body is like a watch: the body's inner workings are obscure. When Napoleon consults his watch, we are given a subtle reminder of his ignorance at a moment when he appears to be fully in control.¹⁷³

Claims advanced on behalf of Soviet military genius are closely examined by Grossman. Grossman argues that the plan of encirclement used at Stalingrad was not an original construct: it was the application of a principle, albeit in a more refined form, first applied by the 'первобытный, волосатый человек'.¹⁷⁴ He goes further:

История битв показывает, что полководцы не вносят новых принципов в операции по прорыву обороны, преследованию, в окружения, выматывания, - они применяют и используют принципы, известные еще людям неандертальской эры, известные между прочим, и волкам, окружающим стадо, и стаду, обороняющемуся от волков.¹⁷⁵

The factory provides a good analogy. The director is responsible for the timely delivery of raw materials and the efficient functioning of the factory. But, Grossman warns, it would be quite wrong to interpret the smooth operation of the factory as an indication that the techniques of Roentgen's metallic analysis were discovered by the director. As in the field of military strategy we must be aware of the reification fallacy.

Grossman acknowledges the logistical and executive roles of Stalin and the High Command, their talent to spot where these principles may be most suitably employed, but argues that the criterion for genius is originality. Size and complexity of military operations fool us. Daunted by their scale we use the word genius to represent a convenient, but fallacious shorthand for our inability or failure to realise the basic principles on which military operations are planned. As Isaiah Berlin puts it, words such as, . . . 'cause', 'accident', 'genius' - explain nothing: they are merely thin disguises for ignorance'.¹⁷⁶ For Grossman genius is something quite specific:

Определение гениальности можно отнести лишь к людям, которые вводят в жизнь новые идеи, те, кто относятся к ядру, а не к

оболочке, к оси, а не к виткам вокруг оси. Ничего общего с такого рода божественными действиями не имеют стратегические и тактические разработки со времен Александра Македонского. 177

Grossman bluntly repudiates the view of official historians that the contribution of the Soviet High Command was

, . . . 'величайшим вкладом в военную науку, ее дальнейшим творческим развитием'. 178

Encirclement appears still less original when one considers the earlier outstanding achievements of the German Army. In brilliant operations of encirclement, hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers were captured. German military science, not Soviet, could therefore lay claim to be the originator of these concepts. Naturally, Grossman's views repudiate any claim to genius that the Germans might make.

Tolstoy and Grossman diverge on the effectiveness of encirclement. Tolstoy's belief that the total encirclement of an army is impossible is, Grossman maintains, no longer the case:

Война 1941-1945 годов доказала, что армию можно окружить, приковать к земле, обхватить железным обручем. Окружение во время войны 1941-1945 годов стало безжалостной действительности многих советских и германских армий. 179

The mobility of modern war has made total encirclement possible, and in addition introduces a new dimension of fear, unknown in Tolstoy's day. Sudden and massive encirclement removes the encircled army's freedom of movement, paralysing initiative and inducing despair. Surrender or death by attrition are the only options.

Tolstoy dismisses the great man's role in history; Grossman is less categorical. To a certain extent this follows from his definition of genius. If the genius is one who relates to the axis of human progress, (and by relates one means has either the knowledge to effect change himself, or lays the foundations for others) then change can be implemented by man. He is not necessarily as powerless to influence his destiny as Tolstoy suggests. Nor, as Grossman suggests, does he have to be a genius: Novikov's decisive intervention at Stalingrad is a case in point. Historically, the veracity of this incident is uncertain. But as a counter to Tolstoy it is effective. Certain well

placed individuals with the right amount of nous, intelligence and experience do seem to be able to grasp the nettle.

Tolstoy's philippic against the great man concentrates on the figure of the soldier-statesman. This is perhaps inevitable, if one accepts, as Tolstoy appears to, the view stated in Voyna i mir, which, according to Tolstoy, is generally held by historians:

...внешняя деятельность государств и народов, в их столкновениях между собой, выражается войнами. 180

Acceptance of Tolstoy's arguments against the great man in the sphere of military strategy and statecraft does not exclude the possibility of great men or women in other areas of human endeavour. Science, from which Tolstoy draws heavily for many of his similes, metaphors and analogies, stands out. Newton's discoveries are particularly important: the differential of history, a borrowing from calculus; the inverse square law; and the many allusions to Newtonian mechanics. 181 Applied to the scientist, Grossman's criterion of genius finds a cogent manifestation and alternative to Tolstoy's despised great man embodied in the soldier-statesman. In Grossman's view, Galileo, Newton and Einstein undoubtedly qualify as great men of history. Their discoveries have had a far reaching influence on man and his perceptions of the universe. Grossman places them in the highest category of a tripartite division of intellectual endeavour:

Истинно великие научные открытия делают человека более мудрым, чем природа. Природа познает себя в этих открытиях, через эти открытия. К таким человеческим подвигам относится то, что совершили Галилей, Ньютон, Эйнштейн в познании природы пространства, времени, материи и силы. В этих открытиях человек создал большую глубину и большую высоту, чем те, что естественно существовали. 182

To an intermediate category belong those who adapt the principles observed in nature to man's specific and practical needs, such as flight and the power of the wind. Finally, we find those who apply the inventions of the second group to existing areas of human activity. Military science belongs to this division. Grossman's comments further debunk the myth of military genius:

И именно сюда относится деятельность человека в области военного искусства, где новые технические условия

вазаимодействуют со старыми принципами. Нелепо отрицать значение для дела войны деятельности генерала, руководящего сражением. Однако неверно объявлять генерала гением. В отношении генерала это не только глупо, но и вредно, опасно. 183

Continuity and a genuine spirit of cooperation are the hallmarks of the scientific tradition. The outstanding achievements of Newton and Einstein certainly reflect their personal brilliance, but they are unthinkable without the more modest contributions of those who have preceded them.¹⁸⁴ Scientific endeavour accommodates the full spectrum of ability. Because of this Grossman's schema is more appealing; it lacks the obsessiveness which characterises Tolstoy's approach to Napoleon.

Grossman's belief in the importance of irrational factors in war, and Tolstoy's conviction that war is something 'противное человеческому разуму'¹⁸⁵ have serious implications for the concept of the just war. For Tolstoy the consequences are implicit in the annihilation of the great man theory. If Napoleon is governed by historical events, and is merely a link in a causal chain, and cannot exercise his will to any great extent, then the possibility of a war waged for specific objectives becomes less likely. Underlying the prosecution of the just war is the assumption of moral justification. Yet as the course of a war ramifies such considerations become increasingly irrelevant or perverted, as both Tolstoy and Grossman seem to suggest. War assumes a will of its own. Describing Borodino, Tolstoy writes that: 'Все делалось само собой'.¹⁸⁶ Grossman depicts Hitler's fears concerning the war with Russia. The initiative has been lost:

Он [Гитлер] начал тяготиться войной, стал бояться ее, а она все разрасталась и разрасталась, эта зажженная им десять месяцев назад война с Россией, он уже не был властен над ней, ее нельзя было потушить, она ширалась, как степной пожар, ее размах, ее ярость, ее сила, ее продолжительность росли и росли, и ему нужно было во что бы то ни стало закончить ее, но оказалось, что успешно начать войну легче, чем успешно закончить ее. 187

A number of key arguments on this theme arise in the heated

exchange between Pierre Bezukhov and Prince Andrey on the eve of Borodino. Prince Andrey cannot accept Pierre's analogy of war with chess. Chess lacks the dangers and privations. In war decisions (if one concedes that they are possible) are fraught with awesome consequences simply not present in chess and other simulacra. But Prince Andrey's most telling criticisms deal with the hideous posturing which surrounds war, and the very dubious casi belli for which wars are waged:

Нам толкуют о правах войны, о рыцарстве, о парламентарстве, о щадить несчастных и так далее. Все вадор. 188

The rights of war legitimise unprecedented crimes. Regulating war, it could be argued, actively furthers the likelihood of war. Dispensing with rules, Pierre maintains, is one way of reducing war. Confronted with a war to extinction, trivial casi belli would be given short shrift:

Война не любезность, а самое гадкое дело в жизни, надо понимать это и не играть в войну. Надо принимать строго и серьезно эту страшную необходимость. 189

This is a remarkable volte-face on Pierre's part. His early admiration of the Napoleonic legend has proven misguided and the quest for personal glory seems futile. Here we encounter one of the great paradoxes of war. Prince Andrey's new understanding, as expressed before Borodino, is only conceivable in the light of personal experience. No amount of scholarly research could have given him such convictions. Successive generations cannot be convinced of the folly of war. Only personal involvement permits them to reach this conclusion; and not all would. For all his supreme skill as an artist, for all his appalling realism in the portrayal of slaughter, Tolstoy was unable to prevent Russia willingly embracing World War One, no more than Remarque, Barbusse and Owen could prevent Western Europe from hurtling towards the abyss of World War Two.

The just war, as envisaged by Prince Andrey, would become total war were it taken to its logical conclusion. Theory generates insoluble moral dilemmas. Could a war, in which all rules, however imperfect and flawed, were disregarded, be just? Would not the relentless carnage render the epithet 'just' absurd, even obscene? Theoretically, Prince Andrey may subscribe to such measures; in

practice he resiles. A sharp distinction needs to be drawn between Prince Andrey's perception of total war and the reality of those total wars which have taken place in the twentieth century. Prince Andrey's vision of total war is a theoretical model, and would, ex hypothesi, only arise in a just cause, the formulation of which is in itself a daunting task. In the twentieth century, technology has made total war a destructive actuality: it shows scant regard for established moral and legal conventions.

The concept of the just war (spravedlivaya voyna) occupies an important place in the thought of Marxism-Leninism. War itself is seen as a socio-economic phenomenon behaving in accordance with specific laws.¹⁹⁰ Grossman repudiates this view and hence the Marxist-Leninist vision of the just war.

In Stepan Kol'chugin the outbreak of World War One provokes intense and wide-ranging social and political discussion. As in the other belligerent nations, the declaration of war is accompanied by an upsurge of patriotic fervour. Bakhmutskiy, one of the leading exponents of Bolshevik theory in Stepan Kol'chugin, asserts that the European Social Democrat parties have failed the test, and have sunk into a 'болото шовинизма'.¹⁹¹ Bakhmutskiy's stance towards World War One coheres with the Marxist-Leninist analysis that it was an imperialist war. Continuing in this vein, he offers an interpretation of the conflict, making certain predictions:

рабочее движение выйдет из испытаний сильным и победоносным, звериному шовинизму не побороть величайшей идеи нашего времени - рабочего интернационализма. Интернационализм должен стать и станет решающей силой в мире.¹⁹²

Events proved him wrong and Grossman seems to set out quite deliberately to remind the reader of the frustrated hopes of International Socialism.

Bakhmutskiy is isolated in his optimism. Rabinovich, a provincial intellectual, is an eloquent critic of Bakhmutskiy, and in particular of the implied assumption that the eradication of capitalism will lead to the eradication of war:

И каждая такая война будет, конечно, называется последней, иначе их никто не захочет вести... А через какое-то там количество лет сын вашего сына будет так же вести последнюю

войну, а потом внук - все так, до конца веков. 193

More importantly, Rabinovich provides a far more convincing reason as to why wars will continue, rather than be eradicated:

Нужно понять: все, рожденное силой, рано или поздно должно погибнуть от силы же. 194

Levashevskiy sees war as a regenerative force:

На войне люди имеют возможность проявить мужество, волю благородств. Война выдвигает сильнейших и способнейших...

Не будь войны, мир умер бы в маразме. 195

Echoes of Treitschke and Nietzsche are not difficult to detect here. Yet Levashevskiy's views define the fate of a large number of soldiers in Grossman's prose.

Despite such diversity of opinion and the impartiality with which views hostile to Soviet orthodoxy are presented, Soviet critics have reacted favourably to the war theme in Stepan Kol'chugin. The following is of special interest:

В изображении империалистической войны он [Гроссман] исследует ее механизм, ее экономику, ее « законы ». В. Гроссман дает выразительные и четкие контуры этого « лица » войны. 196

However, close textual scrutiny offers little support for this latter view. Grossman eschews epithets such as 'expressive' or 'distinct'; and for good reason:

С злым и непокорным лукавством война не дает разгадать себя. Не понять добросовестным схоластам ее законов. 197

The human face as a metaphor of war is redolent of Tolstoy's clock or body analogy. The physiognomy may possess well defined external features, and may offer some clues as to its function. But the deeper impulses, the workings of the mind, like those of war, remain hidden. War's inner dynamic is protean; war is a phenomenon whose laws, if there are any, are 'коварный'. 198 The superficial interpretation of the face metaphor belongs to Lavrova, not to Grossman.

Indeed, Grossman is sceptical towards those who advocate the reduction of war to a set of laws:

Законы войны - не простые законы, и не так уж легко понять их. Пожалуй, ни в одной области люди не делают столько предсказаний, столько самоуверенных обобщений, как в

военной. 199

From an orthodox standpoint Grossman's approach is problematic. The emphasis attached to the elusiveness of war, to the extreme difficulty in analysing its subtle matrices, implies an oversimplified interpretation on the part of Marxist thinkers. In fact the very concept of laws seems suspect, since it prescribes, simplifies and sets limits. Within a precise and narrow range of conditions physical events may be described by laws. Fallacies multiply when the concept of laws as envisaged by the scientist is applied to war or history. One cannot speak of laws, but rather 'a multiplicity of causes'.²⁰⁰ Likelihood rather than certainty is all that can be claimed.

Certain observations, particularly those referring to the significance of chaos in war, were deleted from the post-war editions of Stepan Kol'chugin. Bocharov suggests that the removal of these observations may be understood in the light of Grossman's experience of war. It demonstrated to Grossman the, . . . 'неправомерность такого нажима на « хаос »'.²⁰¹ Atavistic and primeval considerations in Grossman's portrayal of war - whether from the perspective of the trenches or from senior command level - do not corroborate Bocharov's contention. Nor does Bocharov take cognizance of the importance of Grossman's scientific training for his study of war. It is from Relativity Theory, Avagadro's gas laws, Brownian motion, indeterminacy and Quantum Theory that Grossman takes some of his most strikingly effective images of war.²⁰² Moreover, the study of chaos is fundamental to modern science's understanding of the universe. Hence, for Grossman to exploit its discoveries in this way, is to recognise the importance of chaos, uncertainty and spontaneity in war.

Scientists perceive the workings of chaos most clearly in the aleatoric world of the sub-atomic particle, and the many close-quarter battle scenes in Zhizn' i sud'ba may be seen as an analogue of this infinitely small and complex world. Close quarter battle does not unfold in a logical, linear sequence, but by a series of sudden, disconnected leaps. Soldiers collide in a manner comparable to the intermolecular collisions found in Brownian motion. Chaos reigns supreme. The soldiers' perspective becomes distorted. The enemy, hitherto regarded as an abstract entity, now seems close and

terrifying:

В этот ясный для тех, кто переживает его, миг боевого перелома, тайнственный и необъясненный для тех, кто извне пытается предугадать и понять его происходит душевное изменение в восприятии: лихое, умное « мы », обращается в робкое, хрупкое « я », а неудачливый противник, который воспринимался как единичный предмет охоты, превращается в ужасное и грозное, слитное « они ». 203

The orderly, apparently coherent world of the collective, which suggests the reassuring stability of Newtonian mechanics, dissolves into the lawlessness of random slaughter. Time itself becomes irrelevant and it is here that the distorting effects found in Relativity Theory are recognisable:

Более сложен процесс деформации ощущения длительности и краткости времени, переживаемый человеком в бою. Здесь дело идет дальше, здесь искажаются, искривляются отдельные, первичные ощущения. В бою секунды растягиваются, а часы сплющиваются... 204

Our sense of order is further challenged by the provocative and enigmatic view that, . . . 'рукопашный бой происходит вне времени' 205; an idea which can be found in Narod bessmertn. 206 But perhaps the most paradoxical of all is the level of intuitive, inspirational understanding of the battle's outcome, acquired by the participants. For Krymov consciousness is heightened beyond the normal; clarity of vision is absolute:

В хаосе, в котором смешались слепящий свет и слепящая тьма, крики, грохот разрывов, скоропечать автоматов, в хаосе, разодравшем в ключья ощущение времени, с поразительной ясностью Крымов понял: немцы смяты, немцы побиты. Он понял это так же, как и те писари и связные, что стреляли рядом с ним, - внутренним чувством. 207

Bocharov's unease at the presence of chaos in Grossman is not too difficult to understand. Chaos, randomness and instinct are inimical to the sense of order, control and prognostication, which according to Marxism-Leninism form the basis of scientific communism.

It may well be possible to define the just war. But one near insuperable obstacle consists in the various criteria used to

determine such a war, since they are contingent on what we perceive war to be; and our perception of war varies considerably. Hence the Marxist would give precedence to economic or class factors; the student of Freud might prefer man's fascination with ritualised violence; the anthropologist would point to the significance of ethnological or atavistic factors. All are valid approaches, but they describe a partial truth, not a whole one.

Grossman's vision of the just war invokes a titanic struggle between good and evil. Largely bereft of political considerations - and therefore suspect in the eyes of Soviet critics - this basic premise endows Grossman's prose with a power rarely found in other writers of the same period. Grossman goes beyond hate. In the Stalingrad sketches the struggle is interpreted in supra-ideological terms:

Здесь сочеталось огромное стихийное столкновение двух
государств, двух борющихся на жизнь и смерть миров...208

In "Good is Stronger than Evil" ("Dobro sil'nee zla" ;1944) Grossman's vision is apocalyptic:

...все говорит о том, что добро побеждает зло, что свет
сильнее тьмы, что в правом деле человек попирает зверя.209

Stalin's post-war crackdown gave the lie to this hope. In 1953 Grossman's specific vision of the just war was denounced. Bubenov charged Grossman with having failed to interpret the Stalingrad battle from a Marxist standpoint.²¹⁰ Yet the facts of history reveal that very little in the Stalingrad battle favours a formal Marxist interpretation.

Numerous factors contrive to make it a uniquely Russian not Soviet victory. It was not merely a battle between two armies. Large numbers of Russian civilians were present throughout the struggle, many of whom played a vital role in the city's defence. Nor should one forget the mystical and emotional reverence, felt by Russians towards the Volga; what Grossman calls the, 'река русской свободы'.²¹¹ Inextricably bound up with the ethos of Mother Russia, the Volga also marked the beginning of the Central Asian steppe. Further retreat was impossible; a stand had to be made. At Stalingrad the fate of Russia hung in the balance. From the beginning of the battle until victory in February 1943, Stalingrad became the focal point of the national

struggle in a way in which earlier and subsequent battles, often on a much greater scale, never did. Sub-units like Grekov's house 6/1 are the heart of the city's defence. Alongside others they create a 'непорушимое, крепкое целое'.²¹² Given the symbolic implications in the destruction of house 6/1 for Russia's post-war freedom, there is surely a grim and portentous irony in Grossman's description of the war, written a month before the German surrender at Stalingrad as 'жестокая и справедливая'.²¹³ Freedom perished with Von Paulus's 6th Army.

In hindsight, as Grossman realised, Stalingrad was more than a military turning point:

Сталинградское торжество опередило исход войны, но молчаливый спор между победившим народом и победившим государством продолжался. От этого спора зависела судьба человека, его свобода.²¹⁴

Victory had far-reaching repercussions for the physical, intellectual and moral freedom of post-war Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Proliferation of Soviet tyranny would seem to confute the claims made for the just war. True, victory saved Stalin. Repression in many of its ugliest forms continued unabated. But Stalingrad was the beginning of the end of Hitler's dreams in Eastern Europe. Final liberation of Auschwitz, albeit too late to save millions, was now no longer a question of blind hope and wild optimism, but one of time and certainty. Those who fought for freedom at Stalingrad only to lose it after the war, nevertheless ensured that it survived for others: they kept the idea alive. This for Grossman is the enduring triumph of Stalingrad, the final vindication of the just cause.

Cohesion, an unbending commitment to endure, whatever the cost, and a deep love of one's comrades are the hallmarks of Grossman's just war. Spontaneous and democratic, it owes nothing to the doctrinal inflexibility and amorality of Soviet ideology. It is a shame that such magnificent qualities have been so repeatedly misappropriated and debased by hack writers on the war theme. Such sacrifice from a people is only possible at a moment of impending catastrophe. We may argue that Grossman's view is that a just war can only be a defensive war. The parallel with Tolstoy is convincing; resistance to the French was most determined when the need was most acute.

No other Soviet writer can match the extent to which Grossman penetrates the depths and exposes the paradoxes of war. Grossman, while paying tribute to Tolstoy, is nevertheless no slavish imitator, no plagiarist of the epic Tolstoyan tradition, but an independent, incisive and eclectic mind of formidable proportions. Here is one reason among many, why the association with Tolstoy will persist throughout any study of Grossman generally, and of Zhizn' i sud'ba specifically. Another reason, and the most important, resides in the central theme of this chapter. In his portrayal of war in the twentieth century, with its indissoluble links to totalitarianism and its brutal annihilation of the myth of humane and rational progress, Grossman has few equals.

Inside the Totalitarian State

VII

I

Totalitarianism, whether embodied in Hitler's Germany or Stalin's Russia, dominates the intellectual and artistic conception behind Zhizn' i sud'ba and Vse techet. Arguably, therefore, the origins, growth and consequences of totalitarianism, constitute the major theme in Grossman's art.

Totalitarianism, the most destructive political phenomenon of the twentieth century, has been the subject of intense scrutiny since 1945. Numerous scholars have studied it and sought to define its structures, methods and aims.¹ A thorough examination of these definitions lies beyond the scope of this work, but the following sample provides a suitable model for comparison with Grossman.

As early as 1945 Alexandre Koyré described the totalitarian movement as, 'secret societies established in broad daylight'.² Equally succinct, Carl Friedrich has defined totalitarianism as 'the institutionalisation of revolutionary zeal'.³ A more formal and comprehensive definition, and one which embraces the now generally accepted features of totalitarian societies has been advanced by K. Zbigniew:

Totalitarianism is a system in which technologically advanced instruments of political power are wielded without restraint by centralized leadership of an élite movement for the purpose of effecting a total social revolution, including the conditioning of man, on the basis of certain arbitrary ideological assumptions proclaimed by the leadership in an atmosphere of coerced unanimity of the entire population.⁴

Elements of all three definitions are to be found in Grossman. Yet there is much more, and the present-day student of totalitarianism will find Grossman a valuable, and in many respects, an original source.

Important as Zhizn' i sud'ba and Vse techet are for our understanding of this theme, they are not the sole texts in which

Grossman places totalitarian systems under the microscope. Among Grossman's war prose Za pravoe delo and "Treblinskiy ad" stand out. Furthermore, a careful study of Grossman's pre-war writing reveals that he was far from indifferent, as some have suggested⁵, to the changes which tore the fabric of Soviet society apart in the thirties. Collectivisation, industrialisation and 1937, to which Grossman repeatedly returns in Za pravoe delo, Zhizn' i sud'ba, Vse techet and "Dobro vam!", are examined directly and directly in a number of scrupulously detailed and tightly knit rasskazy.

Germane to this theme are "A Little Life" ("Malen'kaya zhizn'"; 1967"), "Young and Old" ("Molodaya i staraya"; 1964), "The Elk" ("Los'"; 1963) and "Several Sad Days" ("Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dney"; 1963). Completed or begun between 1935 and 1940, ("Malen'kaya zhizn'"; 1936, "Molodaya i staraya"; 1938-40, "Los'"; 1938-40, "Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dney"; 1940-63)) all these rasskazy have been subjected to varying degrees of delay in publication. For some, the delay was not far short of that inflicted on Zhizn' i sud'ba. The extended writing of "Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dney" is significant. Written over 23 years from 1940 until 1963, it demonstrates through its themes and protracted chronology a continuity in Grossman's work, which many claim does not exist. None of the obligatory optimism of socialist realism can be found in these early works. Arrests, denunciations, death and social dislocation feature prominently and this is the most likely reason why they were refused publication before the war, or more likely why Grossman never attempted to publish them.⁶ Indeed, given the atmosphere of Soviet society at the time any attempt to publish would have been grossly imprudent, even suicidal. It is pertinent therefore to ask for whom Grossman wrote these stories. Posterity is a plausible explanation. Written in an atmosphere of corrosive fear and suspicion, these stories are one man's record - and in Stalin's Russia a highly incriminating one - of life in the totalitarian state.

One social consequence of Stalin's policies was a huge increase in the number of orphans, the besprizorniki, (the word may be also used to refer to those who lost their parents in the Civil War) whose parents had either perished in collectivisation or were murdered in the purges. Rejected by close relatives from a fear of incrimination,

many of them lived out their lives in the austere world of the detskiy dom. Orphanhood is the theme of "Malen'kaya zhizn'". For the duration of the May Day holiday Lev Sergeevich Orlov and his wife provide a little girl with a brief respite from the rigours of state institutions. The festival spirit contrasts sharply with Orlov's pensive and withdrawn personality. Holidays are a poignant reminder for those without families that something is missing in their lives. Orlov has his young guest in mind and the many like her when he says:

Я устроен таким образом, что мне дано видеть трагическое, скрытое под розовым лепестками. И во всем Орлов видел трагическое. 7

We may see this as a gentle hint from Grossman as to how we should read his stories. Silence, the implied question, and the half-truth all need to be considered.

The hidden element in the girl's biography concerns the origins and fate of her parents:

Откуда она - с Украины, с Северного Кавказа, с Волги? Кто отец ее? Может быть, он погиб на славной работе в забое, в дыму на колосниковой площадке или он утонул, сплавляя лес? Кто он? Слесарь? Грузчик? Маляр? Лавочник? Что-то величественное и трогательное было в этой спокойно спящей девочке. 8

Two clues point to the origins of the girl's parents and thus their likely fate. The girl is a native German speaker; her surmane Mayorova suggests German parentage too. Moreover the Ukraine, the Caucasus and especially the Volga all possessed large numbers of ethnic Germans.⁹ Collectivisation was the worst time for ethnic Germans. The majority belonged to the more conspicuously successful peasantry and were thus singled out for particularly ruthless treatment, which, with Hitler's rise to power, acquired a perverse legitimacy. It seems reasonable to conclude that the girl is the orphaned child of German parents, who were most likely murdered during collectivisation. Orlov's concern for the girl's past, the hospitality shown by him and his wife, provide some modicum of human warmth in her otherwise bleak life. The first tentative steps have been taken towards a fuller relationship. Such hope is entirely absent from "Los'", a deeply pessimistic story of loneliness and

death.

It has been suggested that the source of this despair was an event in Grossman's life; in this case the seizure by the KGB of the manuscripts of Zhizn' i sud'ba. Were it not for the fact that "Los'" was written between 1938-40, this would be a cogent explanation.¹⁰ Alternative explanations for the work's pervasive gloom need to be considered. One of the central characters in "Los'" is a retired engineer, Dmitriy Petrovich, who is dying of an incurable illness. Everything that he has done, or indeed has ever wanted to do, now seems meaningless before the prospect of death. Even his professional achievements fail to offer solace, since they have been rendered obsolescent. On more than one occasion we are reminded of Shatovskoy, in "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam". Abandoned by his former colleagues, he is now totally dependent on the love and ministrations of his wife Aleksandrovna Andreevna.

Not surprisingly, when "Los'" was first published in 1963, such an unequivocally depressing portrayal of death drew censure upon its author, who by this time was himself terminally ill:

Беспредельное одиночество человека в мире, потерянности его, разъединенность его со всеми и с миром - вот о чем поведал нам автор. Но стоит ли в наше время, время борьбы за все лучшее в человеке, подводить читателя к таким унылым выводам?¹¹

At a time when tenacious optimism was the order of the day there was still no place in Soviet literature for the Heideggerian caveat that death and not the construction of socialism, was the ultimate criterion against which the human condition was to be measured.

Yet the polemical force of death as a theme does not proceed from Grossman's empathy with the dying Dmitriy Petrovich, but from the social and political context in which the theme is presented. In this respect the sudden disappearance of Aleksandrovna Andreevna deserves close scrutiny. Contrary to established custom, Dmitry Petrovich's wife does not return from work one Saturday evening. His immediate reaction to her unusual absence is significant: 'Ее нет, она умерла!'.¹² His reaction is identical to that of Orlov in "Malen'kaya zhizn'", who, returning from work, and unable to find his wife, suspects the worst. Despite the reference to a road traffic accident as the

potential cause of Aleksandrovna Andreevna's death and the misleading interpretation from Bocharov that, . . . 'уже случались обмороки на работе' 13, a more ominous explanation seems likely. Why one wonders does Dmitriy Petrovich immediately conclude, and with such utter conviction that his wife is dead? Her sudden arrest is a plausible answer to this question.

There is a large body of circumstantial evidence which strongly supports this thesis. We are told for example that Aleksandrovna Andreevna works in the archive section of the Central Library and that she has a special interest in the anti-Tsarist groups, Narodnaya volya and Chernyy peredel. Both facts are relevant. As an archivist she has access to the past, something of vital importance in the totalitarian state, since the past is manipulated to justify the present, to predict the future. She is well positioned to spot and question such historical gerrymandering. One such case is identified. A steamer formerly called the Sofya Perovskaya, has been renamed the Valeriya Barsova after a singer. Aleksandrovna Andreevna regards this as a slight, banal and unjustified to the exulted revolutionary tradition represented by Perovskaya and her comrades. Renaming is common practice. Historical figures, disgraced or embarrassing to the Party, are frequently erased from the public consciousness in such a manner, in a crude attempt to reshape the past.

Nor are her research interests entirely innocuous. As is well known, both these groups argued for a Russia based on the peasant commune, mir or obshchina. They were fundamentally hostile to the Western model of industrialisation. Against the background of the Stalinist terror, any interest, however remote or academic (or precisely because it was), which might be construed as sympathy for the peasantry, and thus as opposition to collectivisation, would be inherently dangerous. Moreover, these groups, with their tradition of political assassination, offered the disaffected a tantalizing solution to the oppression visited on the people by the Bolshevik autocrat Stalin. To quote Isaac Deutscher:

The text books surrounded these martyrs and heroes with a romantic halo; and so the sacred shadows of the past seemed now to press bomb and revolver into the hands of some impatient anti-Stalinist Komsomoltsy. 14

Aleksandrovna Andreevna comes from a family with a considerable revolutionary pedigree. No exact details are given. However, given the fact that Stalin regarded them as a potential focal point for opposition, any substantial links with members of the Old Guard would provide an additional motive for arrest.

Further danger is indicated at Aleksandrovna Andreevna's place of work too. One of the junior members of the library has severely criticised (raskritikovala 15) her at a meeting, alleging that Aleksandrovna Andreevna has overloaded her with work connected with the 1870s and 1880s. Aleksandrovna Andreevna makes light of it, but one suspects that matters are worse than she is prepared to admit to her husband. At best it is a veiled warning to discontinue her researches, at worst a sign of impending arrest. In fact, the increasing sense of social isolation felt by Dmitriy Petrovich is, as his wife observes, not solely due to the 'мнительность больного человека'.¹⁶ It typifies the insidious process - well documented in Grossman's post-war works - whereby those whose political credentials are perceived to be dubious become outcasts. Their social isolation is the prelude to arrest. Seen from this standpoint, Dmitriy Petrovich's illness becomes an accurate metaphor of Soviet society in the thirties. It is a society that is compliant and uncertain, undermined by fear and mutual suspicion, a sick society. We may push the metaphor further. Illness would seem to carry connotations of ideological impurity; whereas health indicates conformity. Complete cure or death are the only possibilities for the ideologically 'sick'. There can be no half measures. Authorial asides leave us in little doubt that this is the case: 'Раз человек не может выздороветь, ему нужно умереть'.¹⁷ Differences between those haunted by arrest, and those who are not under suspicion, reflect the gulf dividing the terminally ill from the healthy:

Интересы безнадежного больного не могли совпасть с
интересами здоровых.¹⁸

Dmitriy Petrovich himself suspects that his wife's family background and interests are a major factor in her disappearance. He ponders her fascination for the narodniki:

Шурино преклонение перед народовольцами... Какая сила влекла
ее к этим юношам и девушкам, к их короткой дороге,

кончавшейся плахой... 19

The incomplete line, . . . 'Shura's admiration of the narodovoltsy', suggests a break in his thoughts, caused by a sudden insight. It is revealing. Although the question is gramatically distinct from the inchoate line which ends with narodovoltsy ..., the juxtaposition of the two is not fortuitous. By means of it Grossman leads us to the belief that Dmitriy Petrovich's wife will end her days on the executioner's block too.

Lipkin's memoir gives grounds for believing that "Los'" reflects an incident from Grossman's own life. In 1937 his second wife, Olga Mikhailovna, was arrested.²⁰ According to Lipkin her arrest was due to the fact that her first husband, Boris Andreevich Guber, had been a member of the writers' group Pereval. Grossman attempted to help his wife. He wrote to Yezhov, arguing that since his wife was no longer married to Guber, there was no longer any justification for her arrest. Such an act, maintains Lipkin, was what made Grossman Grossman. One cannot but agree with Lipkin's comment on this episode:

...в 1937 году только очень храбрый человек осмелился бы
написать такое письмо главному палачу государства.²¹

Ershov's visit to his father in Siberia and Zhenya's return to Krymov in captivity are of the same order in their moving depiction of family loyalty. Grossman appears to have woven still further details of his personal circumstances into the fabric of "Los'". For example, Dmitriy Petrovich's wife has the same patronymic - Andreevna - as the arrested Guber. In addition, Grossman began writing "Los'" in 1938. This was at a time when Olga Mikhailovna had already spent a year in prison. The absence of his second wife was deeply felt by Grossman. As he told Lipkin:

Ты не представляешь себе, какова жизнь мужчины, у которого
на руках маленькие дети, а жена арестована.²²

It is this acute sense of loneliness and personal loss which Grossman manages to capture superbly, both in artistic and human terms in "Los'".

Such details clarify the significance of the title. Alone in his apartment, or more tellingly 'incarcerated' (zaklyuchennyy 23), Dmitriy Petrovich recalls the circumstances in which he killed the elk, whose head hangs on the wall as a trophy. Initially he is

perplexed by the elk's refusal to flee. On approaching the body he notices a crippled calf at her feet. Dying and now without the protective warmth of his wife, Dmitriy Petrovich identifies himself with the calf. He experiences its agony of abandonment, the crushing isolation. He feels, . . . 'как тогдашний прирезанный в осеннее утро покалеченный теленок'.²⁴ The death of the elk is consistent with the interpretation that Aleksandrovna Andreevna has been arrested, and that her death is imminent, or indeed an accomplished fact. Her absence serves as a catalyst; it accelerates the onset of Dmitriy Petrovich's death. Here, too, a comment is made on the interminable arrests. The sole victim is not just the arrestee, but the relatives whose lives are blighted. Shunned and isolated, they must endure official silence and the very real possibility that a similar fate awaits them.

The parallel with the elk and calf may be taken further. Grossman underlines the calf's gratitude towards its mother. She did not take flight, . . . 'она его не бросила'.²⁵ On one level it acknowledges the doe elk's loyalty to its young. Yet it informs us of Aleksandrovna Andreevna's loyalty to her husband: she has not abandoned him, she has fallen victim to human predators. Thus the remark made by her colleagues at work - they call her a 'настоящая мученица'²⁶ - was an augury. Like the elk she is a martyr; the motifs of revolutionary martyrdom, her interests, and personal martyrdom, loyalty to her husband, are firmly linked. The conclusion revises the traditional roles and qualities attributed to the animal kingdom and man. Man kills for pleasure; his lust for blood is not confined to animals. The silent eyes in the mounted head are eloquent. Like the wounded horse in Narod bessmertn they condemn, but they also forgive. Noble, humane, compassionate and courageous, the elk deserves all the epithets normally reserved for man.

Saltovskaia, one of the few Soviet critics to have paid serious attention to "Los'", has expressed dissatisfaction with the conclusion:

Может быть, таким финалом рассказа автор хотел сказать, что в последние мгновения истина озарила-таки его героя и он постиг величие и всеобъемлющую красоту жизни, понял и принял и скорбь лосихи, и чистоту, и самоотверженность

подвига народовольцев? Но даже если это и так, то выражено столь робко, туманно и неуверенно, что бледный этот облеск не может озарить, в которую погружает нас рассказ. 27

No mention is made of Aleksandrovna Andreevna, a key omission, since she epitomises the self-sacrifice of both elk and the narodovoltsy. The relevance of the latter for the story is lost without reference to her. Nor do Grossman's aims seem to be fully appreciated. For a terminally ill man to lose his wife, when he is totally dependent on her, is a crippling psychologically blow. To demand optimism of a man in such circumstances is unrealistic. Similarly, Aleksandrovna's interests in the past, their significance for the present and her husband's own thoughts on these matters, all of which contribute to the interpretation of the ending, are not discussed. Saltovskaya regards Dmitriy Petrovich's death as gratuitously pessimistic:

Для нас совершенно неприемлем расслабляющий, унижающий человека пессимизм, разъединяющий его с человеком. 28

Such pessimism was at odds with the mawkish ballads required of the loyal Soviet writer:

В жизни всегда хватало и мрака и грязи, и задача искусства, конечно же, не в том, чтобы фиксировать их, а в том, чтобы вынести приговор над ними с точки зрения высшей человечности. 29

This is cliché, the offended irritation of the Soviet drone-critic. Written in 1963, these remarks carried no personal danger for Grossman. Had they been made in an earlier period, things might well have been different. What, one wonders, would the critical/state response to "Los'" have been, say in 1946 or 1952-53, when the advocates of socialist realism still enjoyed enormous power?

The pessimism in "Los'" does not stem from some perverse or superfluous idiosyncrasy on Grossman's part. Rather it is a precise symptom of the loneliness - 'the essence of totalitarian government'³⁰ - induced by the breakdown of individual loyalty and trust. Explicit study of the state's war against its people comes in later works. That Grossman observes and records at a time when many looked the other way most certainly served to further the aims of 'higher humanity'. Neither can the conclusion of "Los'" be undermined, as Saltovskaya attempts to do, by comparison with Tolstoy's Smert' Ivana

Il'icha. In fact the comparison threatens to rebound. Firstly, it disregards the obvious, and crucial, point, that "Los'" is set at the end of the thirties. Secondly, that Ivan Il'ich perceives the true meaning of existence, despite the banality and wretched mediocrity of his private life, redeems him. It underwrites man's spiritual autonomy, not his total dependence on the material world. No metaphysical revelation awaits Dmitriy Petrovich, only an end to agonising, enervating speculation and physical helplessness.

The machinery of denunciation and arrest are far more explicit in "Molodaya i staraya". Grossman's starting point is the Russian countryside and the career of Stepanida Egorovna Goryacheva, a collective farm worker, the lens through which we view their interaction. Educated and trained during the early phase of collectivisation, Goryacheva is well placed to prosper from the impending wave of mass arrests. In 1937 the director of her sovkhos is arrested. Semidelenko, the replacement, terrified of his own possible arrest, denounces much that takes place in the enterprise as 'wrecking' (vreditel'stvo). The outcome is predictable:

За короткое время в совхозе арестовали двенадцать человек по его заявлениям. На собраниях Семиделенко называл арестованных диверсантами и поджигателями. 31

Effective management, let alone satisfactory levels of production, are patently impossible in such an atmosphere of mutual suspicion and fear. Semidelenko denounces others largely from an instinct of self-preservation. Those whom he has attacked are almost certainly innocent victims of a rapacious Leviathan.

One such worker is Nevraev. Semidelenko contends that Nevraev's assiduity and loyalty are a carefully constructed sham designed to fool his comrades. Indeed, Semidelenko argues that Nevraev has been working for a foreign power. The power in question is not named, but in the imaginary world of Soviet jurisprudence, such detail is not necessary. Evoking elusive and malevolent forces, the word 'foreign' overcame rational argument. The victim was irrevocably damned. That the hapless Nevraev recently ordered photographic equipment from Moscow only serves to add weight to Semidelenko's accusations. Goryacheva alone defends him. This incurs the displeasure of Semidelenko, who accuses her of collusion with Nevraev, and even of

being his mistress. Such claims have no substance. But they illustrate the numbing effect of denunciations. Not only does it intimidate the accused into petrified silence - Nevraev says nothing in his defence - but in most cases it effectively silences any support, for fear of attracting the unwelcome attentions of the security organs. However, Nevraev's silence permits another interpretation, which can be inferred from his name. The root denotes the verb vrat', to lie. Literally, therefore, Nevraev's name means 'not lie'. This is not meant to imply a paradigm of faultless honesty, but that in a society where so much that is said is distorted, the nearest one gets to truth is silence. The spoken or written word, if not an actual lie, offers the potential for one. Truth, as Goryacheva realises, is an obvious casualty:

Казалось, все так запуталось, что уж никогда не добьется
правды. 32

Semidelenko's orgy of denunciation does not save him. He is arrested. Miraculously, the authorities to whom Semidelenko denounces Goryacheva, do not act. She survives, and remarkably she is promoted to the post of director. A system of rough justice seems to operate. The integrity of a loyal worker is rewarded. However, if we accept this interpretation, we are forced to accept also the unlikely possibility that Nevraev and thousands like him were suddenly found innocent. Goryacheva's promotion is unexpected and not entirely welcome, since it could easily prove to be a poisoned chalice; as in the case of Semidelenko and his predecessor. Thrust into a position of authority, a more vulnerable cog in the mechanism of denunciation and arrest, Semidelenko is forced to accuse others in order to survive. This does not free him from responsibility for his actions. But it demonstrates the awesome pressure which the state could bring to bear. Tremendous resolve was needed to resist and not all could muster it.

The relationship between Gagareva, another official, and Goryacheva affords further opportunities for Grossman to explore the divisive effects of mass arrests. Gagareva does not belong to the Party, although later in the work we learn that she served as a party activist. It seems likely that she has been expelled for some reason. Thus, in Soviet terms, Goryacheva enjoys a definite superiority. Both

women are travelling in the same railway carriage en route to a health resort. Goryacheva's newly acquired status is quietly and subtly underlined in the discussion as to which one of them will occupy the upper sleeping berth:

- Я уж наверх, поскольку я молодая, -
сказала Горячева.

- Да тут не трудно, с лесенкой - если

хотите, и я могу наверх, - проговорила Гагарева. 33

In effect, Goryacheva enjoys her new status because she is young. Gagareva's reply recognises this, adding that it is not difficult to get to the top, if someone gives you a helping hand - a ladder - to get there. That they live on different floors in the resort reinforces the disparity in social status.

Subsequent conversations between the two women are not as innocent as they appear. Replying to Goryacheva's remarks on the increasing number of health resorts, Gagareva observes: 'Да, огромна забота о здоровье граждан нашей родины'. 34 In view of the mass arrests, deportations and executions such a remark is bitterly ironic. Even more so when we learn of Gagareva's secret, which tends to give the lie to the enthusiasm of her comments on the new Soviet society. Gagareva's difficulties concern her daughter and son-in-law, both of whom were arrested in 1937. Hoping no doubt to mitigate the impact, Gagareva informs her superiors of this fact. Her self-incrimination and the additional piece of evidence that she unwittingly places in the hands of the security organs is an insidious manifestation of the same endemic fear of arrest, which motivates Semidelenko. In her letter Gagareva writes that she considers it her duty to report the arrest of her daughter and son-in-law. This marks a dramatic reversal in the relations of individuals towards one another. Loyalty to the state overrides loyalty to friends and relatives, hitherto sacrosanct. It seems highly unlikely that her superiors do not already know of her daughter and son-in-law. But Gagareva's declaration is nevertheless welcome to those in authority. It represents a further stage in the erosion of individuality and the recognition that the state is the final arbiter in everything. From here it is plausibly a short step towards a signed confession or anonymous donos. Indeed, given Gagareva's readiness to incriminate herself and her family, one

wonders how she would behave in a position of authority. Would she have the moral strength of character to resist denouncing others?

Semidelenko's behaviour reproduces itself in Gagareva's immediate superior, Kozhuro. If anything, it is worse. Described as the, . . . 'самый осторожный и бояливый из всех начальников управлений' 35, Kozhuro does not hesitate to sack any of his workers - a policy fraught with dire consequences - in order to appease his superiors:

Однажды он уволил молодую женщину, жену калькулятора, только за то, что сестра калькулятора была замужем за профессором, исключенным из партии за связь с врагами народа. Это выяснилось тогда, когда профессора восстановили в партии, а Кожуро все еще колебаться, принять ли обратно на работу жену калькулятора. 36

Ostorozhnyy and boyazlivyy are fitting epithets. Yet they are not peculiar to Kozhuro. They are a precise description of the mental state of society at large. Kozhuro's zeal is not appreciated by the Moscow Party Committee. Superficially, this would seem to free the Party from any culpability in the arrests and dismissals. Such disapproval implies an independent course of action, inconsonant with the 'careful and fearful' Kozhuro. He merely follows the line laid down by the Party. Denunciations and arrests were expected; they demonstrated vigilance on the part of an official. Grossman highlights the perennial nightmare confronting people at all levels of the totalitarian state and their constant need to read and interpret the changing wishes emanating from above. Some wishes were unambiguously stated; others, to retain a semblance of legality, less so. Certain signs that the Party has called a temporary halt to the mass arrests are evident; the professor has been accepted back into the Party's fold, and towards the end we learn that the matter of Gagareva's daughter and son-in-law is being reconsidered. The more perceptive would interpret this as a sign to relax their 'vigilance', in the case of Kozhuro to bring a halt to the incessant dismissals and denunciations. Incapable of reading the signs, or perhaps too fearful to take the initiative to stop the cycle, Kozhuro provides the Moscow Party with a useful scapegoat, an expedient explanation to account for the arrests as being due to the excesses of individuals.

The young and old antithesis of the title refers to two of the

work's major themes; the rapid and wholesale replacement of the older party cadre by the younger, as well as, in a very real sense, the demise of old rural Russia - Rus' - in the frenzied drive to industrialise Russia within a decade. Both changes have affected Goryacheva. The transition in her life from rural obscurity to prominence in one of the administrative sections of the Narkomat has been spectacular. Undreamt-of privileges attend such status. The former owner of her dacha was arrested in 1937. Planted (a grim pun in Russian given that posazhenyy also means imprisoned) before the Revolution, and nurtured by successive generations, the flower bed is a poignant reminder of expropriation and lost causes.

Party cars, the ubiquitous chauffeur-driven Zis and M-Is, are one of the surest signs of acceptance into the new élite. Symbolic of power and prestige, they are a conspicuous metaphor of the bewildering and intoxicating tempo of social mobility and change:

Машины шли со скоростью не меньше семидесяти километров, - едва глаз успевал заметить на сером, тускло блестевшем шоссе черную точку, как она начинала стремительно расти, через несколько секунд мимо Степаниды Егоровны мелькали людские лица, сверкало стекло, и встречная машина вмиг исчезла, точно и не было ее, точно почудилась ей женская голова в широкой шляпе, ворох полевых цветов, военная фуражка и так же легко, стремительно возникали и вмиг гасли перед ее глазами деревянные домики с маленькими окнами... 37

Inherent in the repeated pattern of 'stremitel'no rasti and vmig gasti/ischeznut', the sudden appearance and disappearance of cars, people and objects, suggest the essential instability of Soviet society. Individual careers are made and broken with little or no regard for abilities or suitability. Fleeting visions of military head-dress and wooden houses are not decorative synecdoche. They identify the Army and peasantry, both of which were broken and reconstituted with ruthless speed. Goryacheva's observations are relative. From the perspective of those whom she observes she appears as equally fragile and transient, as equally vulnerable to the forces which either hurtle individuals and classes to prominence one moment, or annihilate them the next. Nothing may be taken for granted.

Change has been thrust upon Goryacheva, not actively sought after.

She has submitted to the 'дух движения'.³⁸ Yet she is not entirely neutral; she is wary of the relentless, headlong speed. Sympathetic recollections of her rural past hide some regret at having submitted to the dramatic changes in her life. Memories of the forced collectivisation are especially painful for Goryacheva's mother, Mar'ya Ivanovna. Her husband and older daughter die in the widespread famine. The mother herself only survives because she is accepted into the sovkhoz where Goryacheva works. From this we cannot infer approval of the collective farm. Starvation not ideology was the decisive factor. Central government has created famine in order to break the peasantry, and in the delirium of Mar'ya Ivanovna's dying daughter, we are given a glance at its brutal implementation: 'Маменька огонь кругом, маменька, хлеб горит, маменька!'³⁹

Collectivisation surfaces in Gagareva's conversations with the sanatorium's doctor, Kotova. She recalls a particularly troublesome patient with heart trouble admitted in 1931. The patient, the former head of the local land administration during the period of all-out collectivisation, was known to Gagareva. His death was the subject of much discussion among the party activists. No precise cause is given, but plausibility is not offended if one maintains that the horrors were simply too much to bear. Nagging questions accompany the memory of his death: they should be unequivocally clear, superfluous in intent. But they are not. Was collectivisation justified? Was the cost of the new world with its sanatoria too high? Did the right people benefit?

Further doubts obtain in Gagareva's appreciation of Kotova's garden:

Котова жила одиноко, и Гагарева нравилась ее беленькая,
чистая комната, маленький « отдельный » садик перед окнами.

Этот садик ей казался приятней богатого и большого парка.⁴⁰

In the context of collectivisation one may see Kotova's 'separate' garden - the emphasis is Grossman's - as a symbol of the farm of the individual peasant engulfed by the gargantuan and impersonal collective, represented here by the huge park.

Bocharov has put forward the view that Grossman did not oppose collectivisation per se, only its all-out, hurried and violent implementation.⁴¹ We do not have to consider Vse techet to encounter

evidence to the contrary. Grossman's opposition is declared in "Molodaya i staraya". In order to meet Stalin's industrial targets collectivisation had to be all out and hurried, and since it was a war against a class enemy, violence was inevitable and acceptable. Deliberate burning of grain was one measure employed. Furthermore the destruction of grain recorded by Grossman flatly contradicts claims made by Stalin, and endorsed by his biographer Deutscher, that such things would be impossible in the Soviet Union. 42

Inferences as to Goryacheva's attitudes to the changes in the countryside pertinent to the old/young theme may be drawn from some fine lyrical passages. Goryacheva is drawn towards the sea:

Ей особенно нравилась эти обеденные часы на берегу, когда пляж пустел и волны постепенно захватывали и уносили виноградную кожуру, окурки, огрызки груш и яблок. Горячева помогала воде очищать пляж, и, когда мусор бывал весь убран и лишь волна постукивала галькой да шуршала в песне, она лежала на животе, подперев скулы ладонями, и упорно, точно ожидая чего-то, глядела на сверкающую воду, на пустынный каменистый берег. Ей хотелось, чтобы подольше берег оставался пустынным, и она огорчалась, слыша сверху колокол после мертвого часа и голоса купальщиков. 43

Elusively Chekhovian, the mood is contrastive. Nature's relaxed timelessness is far removed from the feverish activity of man. Postепенно is a key word. Стремител'но, the adverbial qualifier par excellence for the forced pace of man-made change, would be an ugly intrusion. The natural world is portrayed not as something to be conquered as in industrialisation, but as something with which man must live in harmony. Cooperation and balance are desirable. Goryacheva 'helps' the water to clean the beach of debris. She delights in her affinity with the pebbles, sand and sea. Imperceptibly, tentatively, Grossman uncovers the relationship between the individual and the deeper rhythms of the universe, those which until recently have determined the flow and direction of life in Russia, above all in the countryside. Not for the first time is a sense of loss, regret for the passing of a richly varied life, intimated. Appropriately, Goryacheva's reverie is interrupted by the striking clock, stern prefect of the new age, and the new arrivals,

the group.

Goryacheva has much in common with the new class of administrator. Yet she does not totally identify with them. Solitude beckons powerfully:

...оставшись одна на пляже она испытывала облечение. Она слушала шум воды, вспомнила, как девчонкой бегала купаться и, надевая пузырем сорочку, переплывала возле мельницы реку.

Потом она глядела на море и купалась множество раз... 44

Collectivisation was not confined to agriculture. Collectively held principles, the ethos of the group or collective dominated and shaped social behaviour. Peer group pressure, relentlessly applied, became an effective method to exact conformity. Power brought prestige and privilege but stole freedom. Swimming expresses a desire to be free from the collective. It strives for the articulation of spontaneity and individuality which have been overwhelmed in the monotonous social swamp.

Grossman's portrayal of Goryacheva is sympathetic. Nothing in her biography suggests that she has advanced her career through mendacity and denunciation. Her defence of Nevraev is exemplary. Despite the drastic changes in her personal circumstances Goryacheva still retains many of the moral and ethical values of her peasant origins - old Russia. That world is fast disappearing, as the young are forced to become old.

Altogether less attractive are the party functionaries - young and old - in "Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dney". Unscrupulous, mistrustful of one another, and predatory, they are solely dedicated to the pursuit and consolidation of power and privilege. We detect a marked shift in Grossman's attitude. Grigoriy Pavlovich Lobyshev and his wife, Mar'ya Andreevna, epitomise the new class. His wife attaches great importance to education. She very much belongs to the burgeoning urban intelligentsia, the technocrats of the new order:

Она переводила, читала на курсах по повышению квалификации учителей, консультировала в библиотечном институте, готовила кандидатскую диссертацию. 45

Ambition provides the momentum for such unremitting labour. Education increases the prospects for promotion and thus entrance into the higher echelons of the Party. Ambition hardens her, and status

dictates her social behaviour. She refuses to accompany her brother to the theatre. Embarrassed by his clothes, she fears that she and he will be taken for provincials. Similarly, in the presence of those occupying senior positions, she seizes the opportunity to impress:

Ей нравилась показать себя занятым человеком, и она с удовольствием произносила: « какие там театры » или « что вы, где уж мне читать для своего удовольствия ». 46

A walk in the vicinity of the Kremlin is revealing with regard to her ambitions:

Марья Андреевна вышла из дому и пошла через мост. Асфальт, гранит набережной, большое небо над Кремлем - все было серым и суровым. Марья Андреевна пошла по набережной вдоль Кремлевской стены. Звезды над кремлевской башней светилась на темном небе, словно уже наступили сумерки. Сквозь зубцы стены была видна на склоне кремлевского холма все еще зеленая трава, уходил в темное небо купол Ивана Великого. 47

The Kremlin is to Mar'ya Andreevna what the sea is to Goryacheva. She is drawn to it like a moth to light. The Kremlin - what it represents - moulds her ambitions, gives substance to her life. The refrain of Kremlin/kremlevskiy is a vital additive. Mar'ya Andreevna is hypnotised by Stalin, who, though never mentioned, is present in the 'grey and stern sky' and the asphalt and granite. 48 Images of cruelty and inflexibility, these are the qualities which those who aspire to the top of the party ladder most need. It is this harshness which Mar'ya Andreevna's mother finds so uninviting in her own daughter, rebuking her for being, . . . 'так строга к другим'. 49

Grigoriy Pavlovich's standing in the Party rests largely on his achievements in the Civil War. Harsh experiences, as much as age, separate him from the new generation of party activist. Some appear resentful of his past, accusing him of élitism. Matilda, a family friend, is blunt:

Надменность к новому поколению словно выше вашего поколения ничего в мире нет и не было. 50

Rivalries between old and new members of the Party are intense. Grigoriy Pavlovich particularly resents a work colleague, Chepetnikov, whom he has openly criticised at a meeting. With persuasively contrived sincerity Chepetnikov acknowledges Lobyshev's 'comradely

criticism'. But Lobyshev is not fooled, sensing in Chepetnikov a dangerous opponent who avoids open confrontation and prefers to secure his ends by intrigue.

Dislike of Chepetnikov is exacerbated by the fact that he has not served in the Civil War. His explanation is transparent: 'Я поступил в 26 году на завод, а до этого в деревне жил'.⁵¹ Lack of service in the Civil War has proved no obstacle to Chepetnikov's career. Within five years of joining the Party in 1934, he enjoys status commensurate with Lobyshev, a party member since 1920. Success for Chepetnikov is due to his ruthless exploitation of the donos. To quote Lobyshev: 'И все доносы пишет, чуть что - донос, чуть что - враг народа'.⁵²

Lobyshev has every reason to feel concerned about Chepetnikov's activities. Numerous undercurrents in the text, seemingly unrelated, point to his demise, almost certainly as a result of Chepetnikov's machinations. Lobyshev's patronage would seem to have misfired. With undisguised relish Chepetnikov informs him that, . . . 'Твоего Савельева сняли с поста с передачей дела в прокуратуру'.⁵³

Difficulties at work are further indicated by a long phone call, which as Matilda correctly surmises, is fraught with 'неприятности'.⁵⁴ Ominously, Chepetnikov is aware of the call and quick to let Lobyshev know that he understands its significance. These 'подземные толчки'⁵⁵, as Lobyshev calls them, begin to affect his social life, and this is a danger signal.

Mar'ya Andreevna phones Matilda at home only to be told that she has not returned from work. Nor can Mokhov, her fiancé, be contacted. Mar'ya Andreevna learns that Matilda and he have just married and are not at home. They may well be still at work, yet Mar'ya Andreevna senses a lie. Are Matilda and Mokhov responsible for the lie? If not, where are they, and who speaks for them? Grossman's use of innuendo is masterful.

Intuitively, Mar'ya Andreevna suspects that something is wrong. Anxious questions fail to elicit direct answers from her husband. But his response, a thinly veiled plea for loyalty - a major shift from "Los" - is nevertheless revealing:

- Понимаешь, Машук, вот чудесное событие -

Ты вот со мной.

- Все, все обойдется, хороший мой - сказала она.

все обойдется.

Он не поехал вечером в наркомат, решил остаться дома.

Никогда не казалась так приятна маленькая столовая, свет из-под желтого абажура, фарфоровые пастушки и скачущие конармейцы. 56

Lobyshev is doomed. Chepetnikov's donosy and intrigues would seem to have done their damage. Sensing this, Mokhov and Matilda avoid Lobyshev and his wife (or have themselves already been arrested). Sensitive to the nuances and signs, Lobyshev knows that arrest stares him in the face. This may be his last evening with his wife. Even the porcelain cavalrymen are not out of place. They are a reminder of the Civil War, that his past counts for nothing. There are no wasted words or superfluous detail in "Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dnei", or indeed in "Los'" and "Molodaya i staraya". One agrees with Bocharov: it is a story, . . . 'где срабатывает каждая деталь'. 57

Two further details point towards Lobyshev's fall. Chapter one ends with a couplet from Pushkin's "Elegiya", quoted by Mar'ya Andreevna:

Сулит мне труд и горе

Грядущего волнуемое море... 58

Superficially, this might be taken to be a reaction to the news of her brother's death. But Pushkin's lines pertain to the living, not the dead. However, her brother's death is significant, particularly the telegram which she receives and initially misinterprets, believing her husband to be dead. As she tells Lobyshev in the final scene:

Знаешь, ведь я в мгновение пережила твою смерть, знаешь, когда принесли телеграмму я прочла слово « скончался » - ужас, такой ужас, и вдруг я увидела, что из Казани. 59

One feels that Mar'ya's relief and optimism are illusory, and that in the allusion to Pushkin resides the most likely resolution of Lobyshev's departmental difficulties. Given this interpretation there is an unwitting irony in Bocharov's view that Lobyshev, as a former commissar, is the embodiment, . . . 'тех нравственных начал, которые принесла и утвердила в жизни великая революция'. 60 Lobyshev's imminent arrest indicates just how far Soviet society has moved away from its revolutionary past.

Any sympathy one might have towards Lobyshev and his wife is

tempered by what we see of their past behaviour towards Mar'ya Andreevna's family in Kazan. Separation is more than geographical. It underscores the moral and material differences dividing families and society at large. Both brothers have been severely persecuted. Viktor and his wife were arrested and almost certainly executed. Accused of having links with enemies of the people, the other, Nikolay, asks Lobyshev to write to the party organisation on his behalf. Lobyshev evades the request, seeing in it a dangerous compromise on behalf of a relative, whom he has already described as, . . . 'этакий беспартийный инженер'.⁶¹ Nikolay survives the accusation. But Lobyshev's image as a member of the Old Guard, the loyal comrade in adversity, is severely tarnished. He is not quite the 'добрый малый' ⁶² that Bocharov would have us believe. So powerful is the taint of guilt by association, so strong is the excoriation at breaking the taboo that both he and his wife silently condemn Nikolay for looking after Levushka, Viktor's son. If the state is able to undermine so totally the traditional stronghold of the family, what hope remains for friendship? Indeed, is friendship possible? Hence the unavailability of Matilda and Mokhov may be regarded as a 'normal' display of loyalty as determined by, and constantly redefined by, the state.

II

Tyrants are an essential, but by no means sole condition of the totalitarian state. Their shadow is ubiquitous, the hallmarks of their tenure well known: ideology is pervasive; it justifies the leader's actions; it confirms his prophecies; social and economic structures are rigid; rule by terror replaces rule by law; personal life is undermined and fragmented. Hunted down, but not eliminated, freedom endures, the tyrant's nightmare.

Broadly speaking, Grossman's portrayal of the tyrant figure falls into three phases. It will be argued - it has already been suggested - that in this first phase Grossman exploits Tsarist autocracy, inter alia, to give an oblique view of Stalin. Eventually he turns to Hitler. The second phase explicitly compares Hitler and Stalin. Here we encounter a profound analysis of the intellectual and moral consequences of totalitarianism. This is primarily developed in

Zhizn' i sud'ba. Finally, in Vse techet Grossman goes beyond Stalin and Hitler to Lenin. He considers the historical and philosophical precedents for Lenin, in effect seeking an answer to the origins of Soviet totalitarianism itself.

Part IV of Stepan Kol'chugin is particularly germane to the theme of tyranny. Exiled for his part in revolutionary activities Stepan meets experienced party activists, among them Kagaydakovskiy. He assumes the role of Stepan's political mentor, warning him of the dangers of moral compromise. Scorn is reserved for the policy, attractive to many revolutionaries, that the aim justifies the means:

Для революции формула « цель оправдывает средства » опасней
всех конвойных и жандармов, вместе взятых. 63

Nechaev's Catechism is an obvious target here. But in Soviet Russia there are others. Very few formulae could provide such a succinct summary of Stalin's political philosophy. Kagaydakovskiy's remarks may be interpreted as veiled criticism of Stalin's implementation of agricultural and industrial policies, both of which were savage and bloody demonstrations of 'the aim justifies the means'.

Stepan possesses a strong sense of individual honour and responsibility, which brings him into conflict with some of the older prisoners. His sentence reduced to exile, he refuses to work, since according to the terms of his exile, he is not required to, despite intimidation from the prison warder, Cheremushkin. Tugarov, a fellow prisoner, and senior member of the Party, attacks Stepan's assertion of individual rights, which he says is merely, . . . 'личное удовлетворение - эсеровщина'. 64 Conflict among prisoners is to become a major theme in Grossman's later works. Invoking the authority of the Party, Tugarov forbids Stepan to pursue the matter further. Sarcastic remarks on the nature of 'democratic centralism' leave us in doubt as to what is meant or expected by that term. Its contemporary significance hardly needs stressing. Originating with Lenin, it became under Stalin a crude euphemism for the total and uncompromising obedience of the party member, for submission to the centre, to Stalin.

The figure of Cheremushkin is suggestive. Physically unimpressive, he epitomises the insensitive cruelty and bestiality, which so often accompany the exercise of total authority:

Он обладал самым страшным видом жестокости - спокойной, логичной, свойственной самоуверенным людям, не встречающим себе противодействия. Вся несложная философия его системы укладывалась в одно слово - « порядочек ». 65

Yet there is a paradox. Love of order, petty rules and regulations are combined with a complete disregard for legal procedures:

Черемушкин был силой, и все решения губернской судебной палаты и самого правительствующего сената, ничего стоили по сравнению с могучим духом произвола и безответственности.

Это был вечный закон... 66

Cheremushkin's power and influence are grotesquely inflated. In the context of Stepan Kol'chugin they are incommensurate with his position. In Stalin's Russia such powers appear far less anomalous. They are the essence of the curse, 'the eternal law' of tyranny, which continues to blight Russia. With his wanton illegality and brutishness Cheremushkin and his fief are a recognisable microcosm of Stalin's empire.

Not all scholars accept this interpretation. While recognising that in these scenes, . . . 'certain parallels might be drawn between Tsarism and Stalinism' 67, Taylor goes on to argue that:

...to charge Grossman with 'parallelism' in Stepan Kol'chugin would be to base the accusation on purely circumstantial evidence. 68

To this he adds:

Although this final part of the novel was published as late as 1940...neither the text itself nor any biographical data allows us to conclude that Grossman is using the 'Aesopian' technique. 69

To begin, one might consider why it is that one can draw certain parallels between Tsarism and Stalinism. Is this double entendre on Grossman's part due to poor compilation of material, or does it indeed suggest that these parallels are meant to be inferred by the reader? Nor can the parallel between Tsarism and Stalinism be confined to Stepan's exile phase. (Witness Aleksey Davydovich's approach to science, implicit in his diaries). Furthermore, Sergey Kravchenko, Mark Rabinovich and General Levashevskiy all mount coherent and robust attacks on various aspects of Bolshevik theory and practice. We will

encounter still more. At this juncture we might further consider Bakhmutskiy, whom Taylor has described as, . . . 'the honnête homme of the work, the ideal revolutionary'.⁷⁰ Yet it must be said that as an expositor of Bolshevik ideas and policy he never seems to convince his interlocutors. The arguments of his opponents, especially Rabinovich, carry greater conviction, suggesting that they are much closer to those held by Grossman.

One scene is particularly revealing. Volovik, a technical specialist, launches into a hyperbolic discourse in praise of the machine:

...нет другой красоты, кроме красоты машины, и нет другого рычага, кроме Архимедова, а я бы писателям, чем сусолить и мусолить любовь да разные муки, задавал бы писать сочинения о душе мартена, о красоте прокатного стана двести семнадцать, о добром характере каупера третьей домны - вот в таком роде.⁷¹

Bakhmutskiy is bluntly dismissive. As he puts it, this is parochialism of the worst sort, a manifestation of, . . . 'несовершенство мировоззрения узкого специалиста'.⁷² Volovik's love of the machine is only marginally more intense than the fervour expressed in some of the production novels of the thirties. Industrialisation was considered to be an indispensable landmark on the road to Utopia. It was a panacea. Similarly, Volovik's advice to writers echoes Stalin's much quoted assertion that 'writers were engineers of the soul'. Bakhmutskiy's hostility is thus unusual. He attacks ideas which by the thirties had become sanctified in Soviet policy. The effect is heightened still further by the fact that the attacker is a symbol of orthodoxy, one of Grossman's, . . . 'very positive Bolshevik heroes', to quote Taylor.⁷³ There is more than a hint of self-irony here too. By 1940 Grossman's attitude to technological progress was far more restrained.

It is not surprising that some have cast doubt on Grossman's Bolshevik heroes in Stepan Kol'chugin. As one astute reader asks:

Почему большевики так странно выглядят, так странно себя ведут? Образы их далеки от канонических.⁷⁴

Inconsistencies have also been identified by Lipkin, who believes that Bakhmutskiy is 'непродуманный'.⁷⁵ He points out too that in the

second part of the novel which Grossman had planned to write, some form of disaster would have to befall Bakhmutskiy, . . . 'если автор будет правдив'.⁷⁶ That the second part was not written is, Lipkin suggests, 'не случайно'.⁷⁷ It has much to do with the war. From a position of scepticism towards the Revolution's honnêtes hommes Grossman moved to one of outright condemnation.

Taylor's study makes no mention of works discussed in the first part of this chapter: "Malen'kaya zhizn'", "Molodaya i staraya", "Los'" and "Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dney". This is an extraordinary lacuna, given his study specifically sets out to examine Grossman's pre-war writing. When we examine these shorter works alongside Stepan Kol'chugin, not to mention the allusions to classical antiquity in "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam", the case for the Tsarism/Stalinism parallel, or indeed parallels with non-Russian tyrants, is far from circumstantial. If there is a flaw in the Tsarism/Stalinism parallel it resides in the assumption that Tsarist autocracy equalled Stalin's dictatorship. The bloodiest Tsars were no match for Stalin.⁷⁸ On the question of biographical data there is much which undoubtedly did influence Grossman's pre-war writing and attitude to Stalin. Relations and friends were arrested in the thirties, and the censored version of "Dobro vam!", referred to by Taylor in his study, is an important source of information. Taylor was probably not cognizant of the arrest of Olga Mikhailovna - a vital biographical detail - since as far as this author is aware it first came to the attention of Western scholars in Lipkin's memoir.

Classical and medieval tyrants, together with Tsarist autocrats, are convenient analogues for the portrayal of Stalinism. In the rise and consolidation of Nazi totalitarianism Grossman not only found a state whose structures and methods reflected those of Stalin's Russia, but one, the analysis of which was entirely compatible with being a loyal servant of the regime. Parallels are apparent in several key chapters of Za pravoe delo. Attending a scientific meeting, Shtrum listens to a fellow academic's account of life in Czechoslovakia and Austria, among Hitler's first victims. His visit takes place shortly before the German invasion of the Soviet Union:

Люди боятся своей собственной тени, товарищей по работе,
профессора боятся студентов, мысли, душевная жизнь, семейные

и дружеские узы - все под контролем фашизма...

Слова « свобода » « совесть » « сострадание »
преследуются. 79

Reactions to the report vary. Shtrum suggests publication of his impressions as soon as possible. An anonymous speaker admonishes him:

Все это не ново, такие воспоминания вряд ли сейчас следует
печатать, в наших интересах укреплять политику мира, не
расшатывать ее. 80

Objections to publication are based on the current status of Soviet-German relations, which shortly before 15th June 1941, the date of the report, were tense. But another point is made. The bold dismissal of the recollections as nothing new is tacit acknowledgement of the fact that the Soviet Union had concluded an agreement with a state in which concepts of freedom, conscience and compassion are actively persecuted. What now is the worth of Soviet claims to be the champion of the oppressed? Once again the potential of the ugly and cynical Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact manifests itself. True, the pact says much about politics in general. It also says much about the nature of the states involved. Only in the totalitarian state do we find leaders who are capable of such flagrant and ruthless pragmatism, and for whom such a breathtaking volte-face as the Non-Aggression Pact is permissible. The pact amounted to more than just the temporarily expedient abandonment of old hostilities. It ordained the union of the two states in a web of terror, repression and evils, which paradoxically became even more pronounced, after 1941. Exactly when Grossman began to regard Hitler as Stalin's soulmate is difficult to determine. But it is hardly an exaggeration to maintain that the Non-Aggression Pact marked a crucial watershed in his attitude.

The observations Grossman makes on the effects of Nazi Gleichschaltung refer equally to Soviet society. The breakdown of trust in the work place, the intrusion of the state into the inner sanctum of family and friendship and the assault upon freedom speak for themselves. With regard to Soviet society they are all too familiar to the writer of "Molodaya i staraya" and "Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dney". Edith Frankel has no doubts as to Grossman's aim:

His concentration [.....] on the intelligentsia
and their difficult fate was at least as applicable to the

Soviet as to the German situation. This is a striking example of the not infrequent practice of political criticism by analogy in which the dissenting writer attacks a feature of his own contemporary society through reference to Tsarist times or to foreign or hostile countries.

As she suggests such a device poses a problem:

Of course the official critics could not directly expose this type of invidious comparison, for to do so would be to admit that they themselves had recognised the forbidden parallel.⁸¹

Further examples are similarly telling, in some respects more so. Luntz, the friend of a German officer Lt Peter Bach, contests the message of a placard at his place of work:

« Du bist nichts, dein Volk ist alles » . Почему я - ничто? Разве я - это не народ? А ты? Наше время любит общие формулы, их кажущаяся глубокомысленность гипнотизирует.⁸²

Hypnotic slogans and the erosion of individual identity were common to both systems. Both points surface in an argument between Zhenya Shaposhnikov and her sister Mar'ya. Mar'ya, a factory worker, is angered by Zhenya's aloofness, her heightened awareness of self, which she perceives to be rejection of the group:

А главное, ты органически не можешь понять, что работа в огромном коллективе - источник постоянной моральной зарядки.⁸³

As an artist, a solitary worker, Zhenya is indifferent to the claims of the collective. She resents her sister's liberal use of cliché and jargon, her devotion to banality and stereotypes. In the defence of her vocation there is a thinly veiled jibe at official Soviet art and its aesthetic criteria: 'Все люди у тебя как на плакате, а мне вот не хочется рисовать плакаты'.⁸⁴

Not entirely free from error Grossman's portrait of Hitler is generally consistent with the known historical facts. For a Soviet writer, without the access to archival material which is taken for granted in the West this is a remarkable achievement; even more so when one considers the hysteria which surrounds Hitler in the Soviet Union. Lipkin has unhesitatingly described Grossman's description as 'гениальное'.⁸⁵ Grossman explores the historical background to

Hitler, as well as the wider question of kinship with Stalin. To understand Hitler, Grossman insists, we must take cognizance of his various failures. Frustrated in his personal relationships, rejected in the artistic world, Hitler turned his 'неудачливость'⁸⁶ against others. Inferiority and the sense of failure never abandoned Hitler. At the peak of his power it can still be detected, embodied in his dogmatism, which is, . . . 'лишь форма выражения его внутренней неуверенности'.⁸⁷

Loathing of all egalitarian systems and freedom also has its roots in personal shortcomings and helps to explain Hitler's fascination with Nietzsche. Together with the national humiliation experienced after 1919 they formed a fateful conjunction:

Он обратился к ницшевской идее о сверхчеловеке и сверхрасе в пору, когда неудачливая Германия стала растить идею разбойничей сверхприбыли. Эти идеи шедшего своей микродорогой Гитлера понадобились потерпевшей военное поражение Германии. Теперь можно понять с большой очевидностью, что сверхчеловек порожден отчаянием слабых, а не торжеством сильных.⁸⁸

Discrepancies between the idealised physical perfection of Nietzsche's blonde beast and Hitler's own unprepossessing appearance are striking. Hitler bears little resemblance to the standards of racial purity which he insists are the hallmarks of the Aryans. In fact there is an overwhelming sense of sinister imperfection in Hitler's appearance and personal habits, in his 'кривая человекоподобия'.⁸⁹ We are in the presence of a mutation, something which is irremediably flawed. Recognisably human - all too human - there is a repellent, yet fascinating bestiality in Hitler's morally and intellectually crippled humanity.

This distortion is the very essence of the Nazi state, of its retrogressive momentum and Hitler's aims. These are stated with terrifying simplicity by Himmler, one of Hitler's lieutenants:

Это восстание против тысячелетней человеческой истории, это вызов гуманистическому предрассудку человечества... чем внешне беспомощней и слабей жертвы, тем тяжелей и опасней борьба. Только он, Гиммлер, единственный из всех друзей фюрера знает мощь подготовленной акции, которая на языке

расслабляющего предрассудка тысячелетий называется
организованным массовым убийством. 90

Grossman's perception of Hitler suggests a far more complex figure than the international gangster portrayed in so much of Soviet literature and historiography. Plunder is important, but the driving force is a perverse irrationality, a moral and intellectual rebellion. Grossman succeeds in capturing the demonic in Hitler. With his unshakable belief in the power of will (volya), his messianic fervour, the posture of the man of destiny, Hitler recalls any number of Dostoevsky's possessed and driven characters.

Of equal import for Soviet ideology are Grossman's remarks on the extent to which Hitler may be regarded as a, . . . 'истинная историческая личность'. 91 Superficially, Grossman's definition would appear to exclude only Hitler:

Мерой величия исторической личности является ее способность
понять, преугадать и выразить еще скрытую, еще не ясную
главную линию развития человеческого общества, линию,
определяющую на многие поколения движение общества. 92

Yet it embraces Stalin and even Lenin. Hitler and Lenin were able to identify and exploit certain moods and situations in their rise to power. But their ability to predict was circumscribed. Grossman's definition is in fact severely restrictive. There seems no place for any political figure. We have returned to the great man theory and the ideas advanced in the previous chapter.

As Grossman widens his argument against Hitler, so, imperceptibly, are the national and political boundaries breached. Tyranny is no longer a question of what occurred in Germany between 1933 and 1945, it is a universal concern, the defining experience of the twentieth century. For example, Nazi and Soviet tyranny are inseparably linked in the following:

Героями истории, истинными историческими личностями, вождями
человечества есть и будут лишь те, кто осуществляет свободу,
в свободе видит силу человека, народа и государства, борется
за социальное, расовое и трудовое равенство всех людей,
народов и племен мира. 93

That this, in addition, should provide the epigraph for the Soviet book publication of Zhizn' i sud'ba is not fortuitous. It belatedly

recognises that the parallel ethos of the two dictatorships was firmly established in Za pravoe delo, 94 that it was part of its conception; and that Grossman had laid the foundations for the subsequent evolution of the theme in Zhizn' i sud'ba.

Differences between chapter 30, part II in the two versions of Za pravoe delo help to clarify Grossman's real intentions. The journal chapter is a minor personal episode, now chapter 33 in the book, whereas the replacement chapter 30 is devoted in its entirety to Hitler. Whether this is a new chapter in the sense that it was written after 1952 is difficult to ascertain. We know that before Za pravoe delo was published in Novyy mir Grossman made certain changes at the behest of Tvardovskiy, who raised three main objections: the depiction of the war was too gloomy, however true; there was too little on Stalin; and the Jewish theme, embodied in Shtrum was too prominent.⁹⁵ The dearth of references to Stalin was remedied by the inclusion of Stalin's wartime speeches, most of which were subsequently deleted for the book.

This cycle of deletion and supplement relates directly to chapter 30. Was the chapter part of the original manuscript, deleted for the journal, only to be reinserted in the book after Stalin's death? Or was it written after 1953? Unfortunately, Lipkin provides no clues. What can be said is that the analysis of Hitler in chapter 30 of the book coheres with chapters 25-27 in the journal in which life in the Third Reich is examined. This does not suggest, therefore, that the Hitler chapter signifies a conceptual change from that expressed in the journal. One might go further. When comparing the journal with the book, the Hitler chapter strikes one as being organic to the journal version. It is noticeable by its absence. Stalin's absence from the original manuscripts is only apparent - he is there, but embodied in the image of Hitler.

Utterly convincing, comprehensive and fundamental, the relationship between Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia constitutes the central plank in Grossman's heretical, damning, and for some, unforgivable, indictment of twentieth century totalitarianism in Zhizn' i sud'ba. The symmetry is pervasive. We observe the unfolded intricacies of the relationship. Yet the ideas, characters and themes tend towards a greater whole, a more pressing question, man's crisis of evil in the

modern world.

Concentration camps are the waste disposal unit of totalitarian systems, part of the totalitarian state's 'канализация' 96, to use Solzhenitsyn's term. They are ideology's final solution to the problem of opposition. Yet the monstrous simplicity of their inception and implementation raises undreamt-of paradoxes, which both shock and perplex. Confronted with imminent execution, thousands of people behaved in an orderly fashion, while others bore docile witness to their extirpation. We take the brutality of the concentration camp for granted, but what of man's submissiveness 97, which seems to collude in his own destruction? For Grossman this is one of the central questions of our time:

Казалось, что для управления громадой репрессированных нужны огромные, тоже почти миллионные армии надсмотрщиков, надзирателей. Но это было не так. Неделями внутри барачных не появились люди в форме СС! Сами заключенные приняли на себя полицейскую охрану в лагерных городах. 98

An immediate answer suggests itself. Violence is an integral feature of totalitarian systems; to use Grossman's word 'сверхнасилие'. 99 It numbs the capacity for independent thought; it becomes an ethical category, . . . 'предмет мистического, религиозного преклонения, восторга'. 100 But Grossman goes further. We need to understand the roots of this intellectual and moral paralysis, if we are even to begin to understand certain deeply disturbing questions. Why, for example, did well-educated Jews believe that the murder of other Jews was essential for the happiness of mankind? Why did Soviet communists submit to the Party's eschatology? Why did executioner and victim become one?

The fate of Abarchuk, Tolya Shaposhnikov's father, is instructive. Physical servitude is an embarrassment, while intellectual servitude is a sanctuary. Despite arrest and imprisonment Abarchuk cannot divorce himself from the party which he has served, and which has now cast him aside. To a large extent Abarchuk's mental survival depends on this self-deception. Imprisoned by the Party, yet remaining true to its ideals, he sees himself as a martyr, whose suffering will be assuaged by canonisation. With saintly devotion Abarchuk renounces all ideological imperfections. He abandons his wife and son because

of their social origins. Doubters and sceptics are despised. However, Abarchuk's convictions, his renunciation of friends and others, as Grossman maintains, are a form of self-indulgence:

Сладко быть непоколебимым. Совершая суд, он утверждал свою внутреннюю силу, свой идеал, свою чистоту. 101

Abarchuk's self-renunciation, his slavish adherence to the Party, and perhaps above all, his slave-like imitation of Stalin, fatally undermine his personal identity and autonomy. As Grossman puts it: 'Теряя право судить, он терял себя'. 102 The degree to which totalitarian systems can, through terror and propaganda, absorb the individual's identity is one of its more sinister potentialities. It highlights one of their distinguishing characteristics: 'the selflessness of its adherents'. 103

Fear of other prisoners is only marginally less than his fear of the Party's power. Abarchuk witnesses the murder of a fellow prisoner and, like the majority, who feign sleep, he ignores the victim's screams. Inaction and silence are, as Abarchuk confesses to himself, symptoms of 'подлость и овечья покорность'. 104 Both are inseparable from the terror-induced silence which accompanied the murder of the Jews and Russian peasants. It also identifies another feature common to both prison systems. Like the Nazis, who exploited the Kapos, turning them against their fellow prisoners, the Soviet prison administration recognised the value of controlled animosity among prisoners and the domination of one group by another.

All the main threads in Abarchuk's biography, established in Za pravoe delo, are developed in Zhizn' i sud'ba. However, Grossman's attitude to his character undergoes a change. He shows far less sympathy towards Abarchuk in Za pravoe delo. In the later work Grossman's tone is less harsh, is free from sarcasm, and more compassionate. This change is evident in details already given. Abarchuk's idée fixe, the social origins of students, justifies Grossman's remark in Za pravoe delo that Abarchuk is the 'факультетский Робеспьер'. 105 As a member of the faculty committee dealing with admissions, he wields considerable power. Large numbers of students are expelled because they fail to meet the rigorous class criteria. In Zhizn' i sud'ba Abarchuk is far less intimidating. Bereft of power, fearful and vulnerable, he desperately clings to his

political credo amid the scepticism and mockery of other prisoners. Previously, Abarchuk did not hesitate to expose undesirable class elements. In the camps he is far more circumspect, silent and frightened of the professional criminals. A fellow prisoner understands this, taunting him with his silence: 'наш Робеспьер молчит'. 106

In Za pravoe delo Abarchuk's obsession with class origins is exposed as a form of perverse hypocrisy. Comments on his own childhood are revealing:

Да о чем рассказывать, хорошо в детстве моем было мало, жил в условиях обеспеченных, довольно таки буржуазных. 107

The streak of fanaticism identified in Faktorovich is manifest. Imperatives of class cause him to abandon his wife and son:

Он с восходящим классом, он раздавит в себе все личное и эгоистичное, она же, он убедился в этом, всей психикой и идеологией связана с классом, уходящим с исторической сцены. 108

Believing his background to be a blot on an otherwise impeccable set of credentials, Abarchuk seeks to neutralise its influence by relentless zeal. But this is to no avail. Of bourgeois origins, he is a class enemy, and thus, in the twisted logic of the Party 'objectively guilty'. Like Robespierre, Abarchuk falls victim to the very policies he endorses and pursues.

Only after his arrest does Abarchuk understand that ideology offers no substitute for familial relationships. Trapped by the persona of the hardened and still dedicated communist, he yearns for news of his son Tolya. In his dreams it is vital that Tolya retain the name Abarchuk. Above all he craves his son's forgiveness, as witnessed in an imaginary, yet extraordinarily vivid meeting between father and son:

Толя обнимет его, он положит голову сыну на грудь и заплачет, без стыда, горько, горько. И они так долго будут стоять, сын выше его на голову. 109

Though it is a meeting which will never take place in this life - Tolya dies in hospital - its message is potentially optimistic. Abarchuk seeks repentance in the image of his abandoned son, not in the icons of the Party. In this sense his desire for repentance forms

an essential part of the quest for his own identity and self, hitherto suppressed in willed bondage to the state.

However, political dreams are tenacious. Abarchuk stubbornly refuses to acknowledge the failure of the revolution. One of his former comrades, Magar, who has not long to live, identifies the fundamental flaw of the revolution:

Мы не понимали свободы, мы раздавили ее. И Маркс не оценил ее. Она основа, смысл, базис под базисом. Без свободы нет пролетарской революции. 110

Abarchuk's response to Magar's heresy is a raised clenched fist, a gesture which symbolically affirms the violent suppression of freedom instigated by the revolution.

On the other side of the front, in German captivity, Mostovskoy's espousal of the revolution and its legacy are subjected to a far more searching and relentless examination than that experienced by Abarchuk. Chernetsov, an émigré Russian, mounts a stern challenge to Mostovskoy's view of Soviet society. Collectivisation and the terror were not temporary excesses on the road to socialism. In his view they are the essence of Stalin's system. Stalin is the Lenin of his time, and acquired from Lenin the belief in the efficacy of terror:

Знаете, что значили для России свободные выборы в Учредительное собрание? В стране тысячелетнего рабстве! За тысячу лет Россия была свободна немногим больше полгода. Ваш Ленин не наследовал, а загубил русскую свободу. 111

Try as he may, Mostovskoy cannot entirely ignore Chernetsov's diatribe:

Клевета Чернецова была ужасна тем, что питалось не одной лишь ложью. Жестокости, способствующие советскому строительству, отдельные промашки Чернецов возводил в генеральную закономерность. 112

Mostovskoy underlines his own amazing powers of self-deception. Chernetsov's 'slander' - by definition false - is not terrible because it presents a distorted picture, but precisely because it is free from mendacity. This is why it causes Mostovskoy so much anguish. It is this ability to rationalise, to explain away blatant contradictions, to concoct beguiling euphemisms such as 'isolated errors', which renders intellectuals such as Mostovskoy so vulnerable to Stalin's

methods. As Chernetsov observes, they are no match for Stalin, who is unconcerned by the niceties of justification:

Он ваш каменщик, а Вы чистоплюи! Сталин-то знает: железный террор, лагеря, средневековые процессы ведьм - вот на чем стоит социализм в одной отдельно взятой стране. 113

Chernetsov's arguments are telling. But they are only a prelude to a far more sophisticated onslaught from an unexpected quarter.

In a scene of high philosophical and artistic drama, and one of the most important in Zhizn' i sud'ba, SS Obersturmbahnführer Liss lays bare the deep affinities binding Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia. The setting for the scene strikes us as profoundly apposite. It is night, in a concentration camp in the heart of German-occupied Europe. Two ideologues contest each other's vision of the world. Ideas are pushed to extremes. Temptation and even sanity are at stake. It is a scene especially familiar to those conversant with Russian literature. Biblical in concept, it is nevertheless very much of this world. We recall Goethe's Faust, Dostoevskiy's Grand Inquisitor, or the Koestlerian nightmare Darkness at Noon.

Liss does not conform to Mostovskoy's naively simple concept of an enemy. There is nothing repellent in his physical appearance. The effect on Mostovskoy is disconcerting:

В лице Лисса не было ничего отталкивающего, и потому особенно страшно показалось Михаилу Сидоровичу смотреть на него. 114

The overall effect is an expression of 'трудовой аскетичности' 115, a quality which Mostovskoy has come to associate with Bolshevik intellectuals. It seems strikingly incompatible with an SS executioner. A more subtle relationship is posited. Since Liss speaks Russian, one can argue that literally and metaphorically they speak a common language. He is a native of Riga, a town whose recent fate has been influenced by the cooperation of the two dictators, the radical aspects of which Liss seeks to explicate. Liss admits to being a theorist in the party, one who is interested in questions of philosophy and history. With growing revulsion Mostovskoy recognises their shared interests. From the reader's point of view, his reaction is informative:

Мостовской следил за лицом Лисса, и ему подумалось, что это

бледное, высоколобое лицо надо нарисовать в самом низу антропологической таблицы, а эволюция пойдет от него вверх и придет к заросшему неандертальскому человеку. 116

Such visceral hatred is at odds with the internationalist who laments the abolition of the Comintern. It imitates the insidious propaganda used to perpetuate the myth of the Untermensch. It is the language of Nazi racial theory. Inadvertently, Mostovskoy affirms that which he seeks to deny. No more damning use of language could have been contrived by Liss himself. With unerring percipience Liss articulates Mostovskoy's hatred, and here is implicit acknowledgement of their common ground:

Когда мы смотрим в лицо друг друга, мы смотрим не только на ненавистное лицо, мы смотрим в зеркало. В этом трагедия эпохи. Разве вы не узнаете себя, свою волю в нас? 117

According to Liss the Nazi and Soviet states are a, . . . 'форма единой сущности - партийного государства'. 118 The material differences between their respective political systems are of little consequence. They are superficial and do not detract from the fundamental congruencies, which Liss relentlessly enumerates: the massive police apparatus; the ruthless elimination of all internal, and where possible, external enemies; an all-embracing and omniscient ideology; and the veneration of an allegedly infallible leader, all of which are held together by the lie that both states exist for the benefit of their people, rather than to give expression to the wishes of the Führer Hitler or the vozhd' Stalin.

But the heart of the relationship lies in the preparedness of both states to learn from one another. The techniques of repression are constantly being refined and mutually absorbed. From this will emerge a super state, a ghastly totalitarian Behemoth, the ultimate 'модель деспотии' 119, to quote Roskina. This is the prize which Hitler and Stalin both pursue. Hence the justification of Liss's paradox:

Мы - ваши смертельные враги, да, да. Но наша победа - это ваша победа. Понимаете? А если победите вы, то мы и погибнем и будем жить в вашей победе. Это как парадокс: проиграв войну мы выиграем войну, мы будем развиваться в другой форме, но в том же существе. 120

Specific incidents catalogue the spiral of totalitarian collusion. Stalin's destruction of the peasantry, what Reißner has suitably called 'Die Endlösung der Kulakenfrage'¹²¹, is admired for its scale and ruthlessness. It paves the way for the Holocaust. Dictatorship of the working class is synonymous with the dictatorship of the master race.¹²² Similarly, Hitler's 'Night of the Long Knives', the clinical removal of Röhm and others in 1934, demonstrated the advantages of prophylactic terror. Nor are the economic practices of the two states essentially different. Capitalists in Germany, or workers in the Soviet Union, function according to state exigencies. Any suggestion of independence is a chimera. In their respective camps we find the same sort of prisoner:

Кто в наших лагерях, если нет войны, если нет в них военнопленных? В наших лагерях, если нет войны сидят враги партии, враги народа. Знакомые вам люди. Они сидят и в наших лагерях.¹²³

Liss's observation is equally valid in wartime. Mostovskoy, Krymov and Abarchuk are clones of one another. In war or peace (peace is war(?) - the logic is Orwellian) the removal of enemies never ceases. He asserts that German anti-Semitism is not at odds with the Soviet state:

Сегодня вас пугает наша ненависть к иудейству. Может быть завтра вы возьмете себе наш опыт.¹²⁴

The post-war eruption of Soviet anti-Semitism confirms the conviction that the legacy of the vanquished will live on in the victor.

Liss goes still deeper. The basis of both states is the single leader and party. He attributes this discovery to Lenin, in effect recognising him as the founder of totalitarianism:

Он создал партию нового типа. Он первый понял, что только партия и вождь выражают импульс нации, и покончил Учредительное Собрание. Но Максвелл в физике, разрушая механику Ньютона, думал, что утверждает ее, так Ленин, создавая великий национализм двадцатого века, считал себя создателем Интернационализма.¹²⁵

In Liss's view history has played a monstrous joke on Lenin. The scientific analogue is telling. Shtrum takes it further:

Как человечен девятнадцатый век, век наивной физики, по сравнению с двадцатым веком - двадцатый век убил его мать. Есть ужасное сходство в принципах фашизма с принципами современной физики. 126

Modern physics is concerned with macro-phenomena. It seeks an all-embracing, unifying theory of the universe. Totalitarian ideologies were quick to plunder its prestige and lexicon, in an attempt to gain some scientific justification, and provide a beguiling template for social engineering:

Фашизм пришел к идее уничтожения целых слоев населения, национальных и расовых объединений на основе того, что вероятность скрытого и явного противодействия в этих слоях и прослойках выше, чем в других группах или слоях, механика вероятностей и человеческих совокупностей. 127

Both Liss and Shtrum redefine the notion of Fascism. What is generally accepted to be a uniquely German phenomenon is insufficient. Fascism embraces the Soviet Union too. Given that one is an SS officer, the other a Russian Jew, this is a startling conjunction, one of the work's most insistent and terrible ironies. It highlights the strength of Mostovskoy's ideological straitjacket.

Initially, Mostovskoy is baffled by his nightmare summons. Expecting at the very least some physical torture, he is ill-prepared for Liss's calmness, his pensiveness, the sense of familiarity, and what appears to be a genuine quest for answers. That Liss should seek answers in him is disconcerting for Mostovskoy. It underscores their common interests and the powerful attraction of their 'два полюса'. 128 This is no interrogation: it is a meeting of minds. Mostovskoy contrives to put on a bold front. Outwardly he shows contempt for Liss's comparisons, challenging Liss to have him shot. However, his outer calm is strikingly at odds with his inner turmoil. Execution is preferable not only because Liss threatens to undermine his faith, to force him by the power of argument to recognise his thesis, but because it is consistent with his expectations of an enemy. Execution holds out the promise of canonisation. Confession is eternal damnation. One is tempted to speculate as to how this scene might have developed had the roles been reversed, had Liss been a prisoner in the Lubyanka. One wonders whether Grossman has missed an

opportunity.

Notwithstanding his belief that he has the measure of Liss, Mostovskoy cannot divest himself of doubt. Liss exacerbates these doubts. Mostovskoy compares his dilemma to a Tsarist police officer, who having read Das Kapital, reluctantly concedes that Marx might be right. What does he do? He must abandon his post, that his life is wasted, or he must continue, suppressing his doubts. Mostovskoy ~~and~~ continues. He retains the revolution's articles of faith. But we are unconvinced. That doubts should have arisen at all attests the strength of the heretical message. Temporarily suppressed, it works in the subconscious, corrosive and subversive. Still greater problems surge up. To hate Liss is to identify himself with Chernetsov and even the holy fool Ikonnikov-Morzh, both of whom are implacable enemies of the Nazis. Yet Chernetsov and Ikonnikov-Morzh firmly equate Nazi and Soviet tyranny. This poses an acute dilemma for Mostovskoy. In accepting them as allies against Liss he legitimises their hostility to both systems, and himself becomes part of it. Since they draw no distinction between the two systems, an attack on one is logically an attack on the other. The force of the syllogism cannot be refuted. Its conclusion is merciless. Mostovskoy must condemn his life's work:

Но нет, нет, еще больше! Не осудить, а всей силой души,
всей революционной страстью своей ненавидеть
лагеря, лубянку, кровавого Ежова, Ягоду, Берию!
Но мало - Сталина, его диктатуру! ...но нет, нет
больше! надо осудить Ленина! край пропасти! 129

Tottering on the brink of disaster, Mostovskoy withdraws, dismissing his dread as an hallucination. But his thoughts find a cold and remorseless reflection in Liss, his 'хирургическое зеркало'. 130

Nothing is hidden from Liss the surgeon:

На нас сегодня смотрят с ужасом, а на вас с любовью и
надеждой? Поверьте, кто смотрит на нас с ужасом, и на вас
смотрит с ужасом. 131

Not surprisingly the issues raised in the confrontation between Liss and Mostovskoy have attracted considerable attention from Soviet critics. Many are at ill at ease with Grossman's uncompromising model of Nazi-Soviet comity. Bocharov's articles reveal the extent of the

concern:

Впрочем, временами в « Жизни и судьбе » все-таки недостаточно разграничиваются сталинский « отпечаток » и глубинная суть социалистического строя. Автор, видимо, увлекся внешне заманчивой параллелью: как характер Гитлера « глубоко и полно выразил характер фашистского государства » так характер Сталина выразил черты советского государства. 132

This is a somewhat myopic assessment. The basis for Grossman's parallels is ignored, as is his redefinition of Fascism. Furthermore, if Stalin was merely(!) a hideous aberration of socialist legality, why, one wonders, have the Soviet people had to wait so long for the full extent of his crimes to be officially acknowledged?

Part of the answer lies in Zhizn' i sud'ba. The Soviet Union was one of the victors of 1945, and as Stalin realised, at the moment of his triumph, . . . 'победителей не судят'. 133 Hitler's nemesis was Stalin's salvation. The process of Vergangenheitsbewältigung, which has been a feature of post-war Germany, has until the succession of Gorbachev only received scant and sporadic support in the Soviet Union. When Grossman submitted Zhizn' i sud'ba for publication in 1960, a large number of Soviet politicians, who had made their careers under Stalin's patronage were still in office. To have permitted publication of Grossman's novel would have been to turn the spotlight on themselves. That the Soviet reading public has had to wait more than a quarter of a century for Zhizn' i sud'ba, underlines just how powerful and enduring their influence has been. Unimaginative and sprawling bureaucracy was a radical feature of Stalin's Russia. It was an essential factor in the control of empire and subjects. Zhizn' i sud'ba abounds in examples of its pernicious and dehumanising influence. Its lasting achievements are fear of the state - Grossman's gosstrakh is a biting parody of Soviet officialese - and homo lakeus, the new subservient man. Even when Stalin died the system functioned as before. It is this entrenched bureaucracy which has brought the Soviet Union to its present ideological and economic crisis and made the campaign of perestroyka such an urgent necessity. Were the Stalinist legacy a mere stamp, as Bocharov has suggested, the campaign of perestroyka would be otiose.

Bocharov's frequent use of the 'the cult of personality', the euphemism for Stalin (by no means confined to Bocharov), is singularly inconsonant with the avowed aims of glasnost'. That the 'cult of personality' continues to be used is telling. It reflects the deep-seated mixture of awe, and even fear, still commanded by Stalin's memory. A concession to Partyspeak, to the, . . . 'условностям партийно-эвфемистической речи' 134, it is too out of place with the ethos of Zhizn' i sud'ba, almost an affront to its author. To quote Efim Etkind:

«Культ личности» - это смягчающее, безобидно-успокоительное наименование небывалой в мировой кровавой тирании обезумевшего от казней самодержца. Гроссман никогда не позволяет себе такого стилистического лукавства: его слово - прямое, точное, убийственно правдивое. 135

Lacking as they do any specific and detailed textual references, Bocharov's objections to Grossman's wide-ranging parallelism, dismissed as 'опрометчивые сближения' 136, are hardly convincing. The 'cult of personality' is one of various epithets and euphemisms, whose insinuation masks Grossman's real message. Their effect is far from benign. To accept the partnership in totalitarianism of Hitler and Stalin is, Bocharov avers, to conclude that:

... лишь бесконечное народное самоотвержение в борьбе за правое революционное дело, за родину, за уничтожение фашизма позволило выиграть войну. 137

It would be foolish and arbitrary to disregard the contribution of the Soviet High Command to the defeat of Hitler. But the brunt of the struggle was borne by the people. The theme of the people's war reverberates throughout Grossman's prose. Grossman's war is a just people's war, not a just revolutionary cause. Quite the reverse, Grossman's soldiers are sustained by a vision of post-war Russia without the kolkhoz, terror and Kolyma. In this context, revolyutsionnyy is Bocharov's word, not Grossman's. For in the lexicon of Zhizn' i sud'ba 'revolyutsionnyy' and pravyy are mutually exclusive.

Attempts to persuade the Soviet reader that Grossman never lost his confidence in Soviet power are even more ill-considered:

Можно ли отнять у художника право на раздумья и сомнения,

можно ли « закрыть тему », сославшись на то, что все необходимые формулировки уже высказаны в партийной печати? Пусть его мысли подчас спорны, неожиданы, но это опять-таки от раздумий над путями, а не от сомнений в самих идеалах. 138

Textual lacunae in the Soviet journal and book versions of Zhizn' i sud'ba indicate that the guardians of Soviet literature have not fully conceded the writer the right to entertain doubts or pursue speculations in areas which some diehards still consider sensitive. Irreconcilable disagreements between author and state are glossed over by reference to the Party's formulations. To suggest that the Party's formulations are a repository of answers to the questions raised by Zhizn' i sud'ba is a perverse misrepresentation of the novel's aim. Zhizn' i sud'ba and its author are in open revolt against the Party. Fellow travellers they were most certainly not.

Equally tendentious is Kulish's interpretation:

Но нельзя признать правильным, что эти события, возглавляемые Сталиным, « явились логическим результатом октябрьской революции ». И индустриализация и коллективизация - действительно логическое следствие развития революции, но методы и, естественно, последствия их, а тем более массовые репрессии, административно-командное управление - это уже результат не революции, не социализма, а деформации, фактически прервавшей процесс развития революционного самосознания трудящихся. 139

Does this mean that Stalinism was an irrational manifestation? If so, what credence may be attached to the other claims of scientific communism? Moreover, such an explanation studiously ignores the central question: whence came this deformation? Ipsa facto a deformation is a manifestation of the potential, which inheres in a given system. (Latent heat seems particularly suitable as an analogy.) Why Stalinism, as opposed to some other system, came to predominate is another question, and one which is more fully addressed in Vse techet.

Mostovskoy's temptation has prompted several responses. Bocharov's has been the most orthodox, by which one means that he has sought to play down Mostovskoy's refusal to be drawn into discussion with Liss. Mostovskoy's fears and anxieties are ignored. In the light of this

one simply cannot accept the assessment that, he, Mostovskoy, . . . 'попадает на край пропасти отчаяния и вновь обретает веру'.¹⁴⁰ No evidence can be found to corroborate the thesis that Mostovskoy has met and overcome the challenge embodied by Liss. Indeed, Mostovskoy fails to deliver a firm rebuttal to Liss, which, as Bocharov acknowledges, is demanded by the canons of Soviet literature. Bocharov's reasoning is dubious:

И здесь автор полагается на наше здоровое восприятие. По привычным канонам нашей литературы Мостовской должен был бы непременно давать развернутый и обстоятельный отпор злокозненным суждениям Чернецова и Лисса по всем пунктам, но Мостовской своими репликами предостерегает нас и одновременно заставляет задуматься. А в состоятельной работе мысли - залог прочной убежденности.¹⁴¹

To a certain extent Grossman does rely on our 'sensible perception' or 'good sense'. But it leads in a different direction from that intended by Bocharov. Mostovskoy dare not take up the cudgels. To do so is to invite the wholesale subversion of his Weltanschauung, already perilously close. Interjection is no substitute for sustained argument. Therefore, Mostovskoy retreats behind a fragile defence of silence, attempting to repel Liss by repeated exhortations to himself: 'Молчать, главное молчать, не вступать в разговор, не выражать'.¹⁴² This is a far cry from the self-confident, imperiously didactic, political philosopher portrayed in Za pravoe delo, whom in Zhizn' i sud'ba Liss mockingly refers to as 'teacher'. Mostovskoy is incapable of independent action outside the parameters determined by the Party. He supinely condones Ershov's murder, seeing it as his duty as a 'член партии' to do so.¹⁴³ He fails to contest the dissolution of the Comintern, and when confronted with the nightmarish possibility that the whole Soviet enterprise is bankrupt, cowers before the 'динамит свободы'.¹⁴⁴ One cannot but agree with Igor' Zolotusskiy:

Этой самой свободы и боится больше всего Мостовской. Она для него страшной жизни, страшной смерти, смерть подчинения идее, которую он почитает выше божества, выше даже своего существования.¹⁴⁵

Critics have tended to accept Liss at face value. But in fact he

is not quite what he seems. He appears to be a trusted and devout member of the Nazi Party, one who accepts Hitler's teachings without question. Yet this assessment is hardly adequate. Liss's position as a theorist in the Party, his interests in history and philosophy, his intention to embark on a study with the intriguing title, The Ideology of the Enemy and his Leaders, all strongly suggest that his intellectual proclivities have taken him from the realms of party orthodoxy into heresy. The parallels he draws between Stalinist Russia and Nazi Germany would be as unacceptable to the faithful of the Nazi Party, as they would to any ardent Bolshevik. Liss stands outside and beyond both ideologies. Yet he is indissolubly linked to the two. He is the spectre of nihilism, the beckoning spirit of the void, to which both systems ineluctably lead. As befits members of a diabolic priesthood, Liss and Mostovskoy see no contradiction between the construction of Utopia and the annihilation of millions of human lives. They admirably typify that cast of mind, which, . . . 'thought in continents and felt in centuries'.¹⁴⁶ We need look no further than Suslov's remarks concerning the publication of Zhizn' i sud'ba to find a striking illustration of this mentality.

The crushing imbalance of power which exists between individual and state is the very essence of totalitarian systems. There is nothing mysterious in this situation. Individuality, conscience and freedom are obstacles on the path towards total control and manipulation. The unequal struggle which the individual must wage for his personal integrity and survival assumes many forms in Zhizn' i sud'ba. The vicissitudes of Shtrum and his scientific colleagues are especially revealing. Grossman undertakes serious examination of the state and its policies by introducing the reader to the closed, conspiratorial world of intimate friends and colleagues. Such scenes are very much redolent of the traditions of the nineteenth-century kruzhok, although in Stalin's Russia the existence of such circles is far more hazardous. Mad'yarov bitterly resents the attempts of the state to regulate reality, and he bemoans the lack of unbiased information, available to the Soviet public, and the state's assumption of intellectual infallibility:

Вы входите в книжный магазин и покупаете книгу, оставаясь советским человеком, читаете американских, английских,

французских философов, историков, экономиков, политических обезревателей. Вы сами разбираетесь, в чем они не правы; вы сами - без няни гуляете по улицам. 147

However, not all appreciate Mad'yarov's iconoclasm. Sokolov feels obliged to rehearse the official line. One detects a wilful blindness in his arguments: bourgeois democracy is an illusion; and the debacles of the Soviet-Finnish war and the humiliating retreat to the Volga in no way reflect shortcomings on the part of the Soviet Army. Above all, Sokolov sings the praises of the Soviet state's structure:

...наш централизм - это социальный двигатель гигантской энергетической мощи, способный совершить чудеса. И он уже совершил их. И он их совершит в будущем. 148

But, as Mad'yarov points out, these projects are instigated by the state for the state. They merely underline the huge boundary between state and individual:

На одном полюсе - потребность государства, на другом - потребность человека. Их никогда не примиришь. 149

This conversation marks a turning point in Shtrum's attitude towards the Soviet state. Increasingly, he resents the disparities between artificial and extant reality, and the morbid and relentless deification of Stalin. Matters come to a head as a result of Shtrum's scientific researches. Called upon to renounce his researches at a public meeting, Shtrum refuses. Condemnation is universal. Fellow scientists follow the line laid down for them by the Party, meekly endorsing the rejection of their colleagues. Towards the vast majority of his colleagues Shtrum feels no anger, and in this there is perhaps an implicit recognition of the helplessness of the individual. But for Sokolov there is real anger:

Казалось, все жестокое, несправедливое, что совершило было против Штрума, исходило от Соколова. Как Петр Лаврентьевич мог запретить Марье Ивановне бывать у Штрумов! Какая трусость, сколько в этом жестокости, подлости, низости! 150

Shtrum's domestic life rapidly deteriorates. Hints are dropped that Shtrum's flat is too big. Access to shops catering for the state's élite is limited. Difficulties with passport renewal are inevitable because of the need for a reference from the place of work. Crushed by loneliness and haunted by the prospect of penury, Shtrum

longs for arrest as a release from the relentless psychological pressure. Yet even such release from the terror is dependent on the state. Gradually, Shtrum comes to realise that in the end the individual is denied any freedom of action:

Казалось, что государство в своем гневе способно отнять у него не только свободу, покой, но и ум, талант, веру в себя, превратить его в тусклого, тупого, унылого обывателя. 151

Bereft of any freedom of action and fearing the night, the partner of arrest, Shtrum feels like a 'дикарь каменного века'. 152 Stalin's personal intervention, deus ex machina, terminates the campaign against him. Convinced that Shtrum's work is of value, Stalin phones him, assuring him of support. 153 No other act of Stalin could be better calculated to foster the myth of the benevolent leader. Yet no other act demonstrates the power vested in the totalitarian leader and his very words:

Одно его слово могло уничтожить тысячи, десятки тысяч людей. Маршал, нарком, член Центрального Комитета партии, секретарь обкома - люди, которые вчера командовали армиями, фронтами, властвовали над краями, республиками, огромными заводами, сегодня по одному гневному слову Сталина могли обратиться в ничто, в лагерную пыль, позванивая котелочками, ожидать баланды у лагерной кухни. 154

The new upward turn in Shtrum's domestic and professional life is dramatic, grotesquely so. There is an undignified scramble to bury enmities on the part of former opponents. Converts to his researches multiply. Two details, hardly noticed, tell of his return to favour: the discreet, unsolicited return of the party car and the highly prized ration cards. Lifting the anathema confirms a colleague's belief:

...если ваша идея совпадает с интересом государства, лететь вам на ковре-самолете! 155

Other effects of this volte-face are more insidious. Fêted by a system, which he has previously despised, Shtrum undergoes a subtle change. Mad'yarov's sulphurous criticism, once valued by Shtrum, now seems irrelevant, and Mad'yarov's fate is of little interest. Conversely, those who were among Shtrum's most implacable opponents, Korchenko and Shishakov, and acknowledged by Shtrum as such, appear in

a different light. Shtrum begins to regard these changes in his own outlook as legitimate, and that which occurred before as the exception. However, the changes are two sides of the same coin. Shtrum's sense of triumph over his enemies, and his sense of freedom are illusory. He has been saved not because he has convinced the state of his moral rectitude, but because the state, alarmed by Western advances in atomic research, cannot do without him. The reversal in Shtrum's attitudes is not confined to him. Shtrum recalls Bagryanov, an old friend of Krymov. Arrested in 1937 and released two years later, Bagryanov makes an impassioned plea on behalf of freedom after his release, declaring his solidarity with the camp inmates. But his espousal of liberalism does not last. Rehabilitated to his former rank and status, or perhaps seduced, Bagryanov finds no difficulty in accommodating a 'Hegelian stance' to what has happened. Thus he concludes that, . . . 'Все действительное разумно' 156, obviating the need to explain his personal fate.

Shtrum's agonies are not over. In response to accusations in the Western press that thousands of scientists and writers have been persecuted, a letter is to be drafted protesting the slander. As a leading Soviet intellectual Shtrum's signature is required. Mindful of his earlier trials, and undermined by the sickening familiarity of Korchenko and Shishakov, he capitulates. Any suggestions that Shtrum had earlier won a moral victory are brutally shattered. In accepting rehabilitation (could he refuse?), Shtrum fatally weakened his moral autonomy. Shtrum's capitulation is based on Grossman's own bitter experience. Under pressure he put his signature to a letter demanding retribution for those Jewish doctors involved in the state-fabricated Doctors' Plot. Thereafter Grossman was haunted by deep remorse. 157 Nevertheless, strangely enriched, even hardened by his humiliation, Shtrum, like his creator, comes to terms with his guilt. Hitherto blurred, the lines of conflict between state and individual, between slavery and freedom, are now starkly drawn, and the nature of the challenge stands precisely defined:

Каждый день, каждый час, из года в год, нужно вести борьбу за свое право быть человеком, быть добрым и чистым. И в этой борьбе не должно быть ни гордости ни тщеславия, одно лишь смирение. А если в страшное время придет безвыходный

час, человек не должен бояться смерти, не должен бояться, если хочет остаться человеком. 158

Shtrum's moving and defiant realisation is the common thread linking many of Grossman's finest portraits. Whether on the battlefield, or in the gruelling struggle against bureaucracy, or ultimately in the last seconds of life in the gas chamber, Grossman's heroes and heroines inspire us with their dignity, humility and courage. Notwithstanding the state's appalling capacity for violence, and its mindless vindictiveness, we are left with the conviction that the human aspiration towards freedom can never be completely eradicated, that despite the threat of death - indeed because he chooses to embrace it - man remains man.

Resistance to the state and defiance unto death are strikingly illustrated in the testament and behaviour of Ikonnikov-Morzh. Morzh's testament, a discordant voice in the moral wasteland of the twentieth century, attacks the very heart of totalitarian ideologies. It articulates Grossman's deepest held beliefs. Without a doubt it is the philosophical core of the novel, the triumphal assertion of heresy. Central to Morzh's thesis is the question of good. He insists that so much of the evil which has afflicted man originates from the various perceptions of good:

Византийское иконоборство, пытки инквизиции, борьба с ересями во Франции, в Италии, Фландрии, Германии, борьба протестанства и католичества, коварства монашеских орденов, борьба Никона и Аввакума, многовековой гнет, давивший на науку и свободу, христианские истребители языческого населения Тасмании, злодеи, выжигавшие негритянские деревни в Африке. Все это стоило большего количества страданий, чем злодеяния разбойников и злодеев, творивших зло ради зла... 159

Abstract concepts of good are fundamentally inimical to the human condition, since they are based on a limitless faith in the power of reason and technological advance. In the twentieth century the implementation of such concepts has led directly to mass murder in the Russian countryside and to the crematoria of Eichmann's death camps. Extreme scepticism should always be reserved for the ex cathedra judgements of political philosophers as to what constitutes good.

Inevitably they proceed from the inherently flawed premise that good is a definable category, contingent on logic: 'Даже проповедь Иисуса лишила ее силы'.¹⁶⁰ Moreover it is too narrowly defined, as Morzh warns:

...добро секты, класса, нации, государства стремится придать себе ложную всеобщность, чтобы оправдать свою борьбу со всем тем, что является для него злом. ¹⁶¹

The good, more precisely, the goodness of which Morzh writes, cannot be so reduced. It is incorporeal, irrational and ineffable, yet it lies at the very heart of man's being. Neither the SS nor the NKVD can totally vanquish it:

В бессилии бессмысленной доброты тайна ее бессмертия. Она непобедима. Чем глупей, чем бессмысленней, чем беспомощней она, тем огромней она. Зло бессильно перед ней! Пророки, вероучители, реформаторы, лидеры, вожди бессильно перед ней. Она - слепая и немая любовь - смысл человека. ¹⁶²

Examples of Morzh's, . . . 'житейская, человеческая доброта'¹⁶³ are ubiquitous. In keeping with his beliefs, they are often to be found where evil and human wretchedness are at their worst: Darenskiy's intervention on behalf of German prisoners being subjected to a savage beating; the gift of bread to a German officer in the rubble of Stalingrad from a Russian woman, herself perilously close to starvation; and Sofya Levinton's protective, maternal warmth extended to her surrogate son, David in their last moments in the gas chamber. All these incidents bear witness to the capacity of goodness to transcend national and ideological boundaries. Moreover, they themselves are witnessed, both by man, and even by God.

Grossman's wartime experiences and his revulsion against violence ¹⁶⁴ suggest the most convincing explanation for the inclusion of Morzh's testament in the novel. Certainly Markish has no doubts, seeing "Staryy uchitel'" as the seminal work.¹⁶⁵ Yet, in our view it is in Stepan Kol'chugin that we really find the origins of the views that Morzh espouses. In the first chapter of Zhizn' i sud'ba Morzh makes his hostility to Bolshevik methods known to Mostovskoy: 'Ведь для вас цель оправдывает средства, а средства ваши безжалостны'.¹⁶⁶ This endorses the warning given to Stepan by Kagaydakovski. We have already discussed the implications of Aleksey Davydovich's dobrota

serdtsa. Other characters are equally sceptical about the claims made by ideology. Lobavanov, one of Bakhmutskiy's many opponents, sees dangers in a Bolshevik triumph:

Вы сегодня - лишь несколько доктринеров - но завтра можете стать глашатаями миллионов. 167

Danger resides in doctrine. Narrowly interpreted, yet applied with great ruthlessness across all existing socio-economic spectra, it possesses great potential for evil. What Russia needs, argues Lobavanov, is not domination by the few, but

...длительная школа демократии, парламентских свобод, воспитания сознания, долгие выдавливания раба, как говорил Чехов. 168

Like Morzh, Lobavanov stresses the, . . . 'ценность личности'. 169 In 1940 this was a lament rather for past and future rather than a realistic caveat that would be heeded.

In Za pravoe delo Chepyzhin sounds a note of caution with regard to the creation of elites:

...сами вожди фашистского злодейства и насилия всегда убеждают народы, что они будто бы поборники общественного добра и справедливости. Главные преступления свои они творят втайне, на опыте знают, что зло рождает не только зло, что оно может не только подавить добро, но и вызвать его. 170

This is a draft of Morzh's testament. It does not require too great a leap of imagination to see this as a summary of both Hitler's and Stalin's methods. Chepyzhin's use of dobro differs from that in Zhizn' i sud'ba. Here it pertains to both state and individual. Thereafter the two are sharply divided. Dobro is the good of the state, good with a capital letter. Dobrota is the victim of the state's organised violence.

In the transition from Za pravoe delo to Zhizn' i sud'ba we note an important change in Morzh's name. In the earlier work it is Dmitriy Ivannikov-Morzh. It is he who passes on the final letter of Shtrum's mother, the contents of which are only revealed in Zhizn' i sud'ba. The change in name from Ivannikov to Ikonnikov may be understood within the context of his death. He refuses to work on the construction of a gas chamber. For this he is executed. He chooses

death rather than moral compromise. Compared with the abysmal conduct of many of his fellow prisoners, he is a symbol of a moral absolute, a Christ figure, whose image - as his name suggests - is to be taken as an example.

With some justification it has been suggested that many of Grossman's heroes are 'на попоре молитвы'.¹⁷¹ In the case of Morzh this is certainly true. His text is a prayer. However, the prayer is totally unorthodox, any suggestion of divine inspiration is vulnerable. In an early chapter Morzh renounces his faith in God, having witnessed the mass execution of twenty thousand Jews. Dobrota is recognition of man's spiritual being without crossing the threshold to belief. Theologians would undoubtedly disagree. Morzh's testament is not only rejection of the world's inhuman isms; it is a symptom of Grossman's own crisis. Apostasy and heresy may mean that an individual's political, ideological and religious loyalties have been radically reshaped. However, past beliefs and structures die hard. Intellectual and psychological needs are not totally changed.

Grossman is a unifier, one of those who seek a comprehensive explanation of man's condition in the universe, and ultimately, of the universe itself. With his scientific background Grossman doubtless found the all-embracing epistemology of Marxism-Leninism enticing. True to the spirit of scientific enquiry, Grossman had to reconsider its essential premisses when it was shown to be a busted flush. The testament of Ikonnikov-Morzh is the lyrical exposition of Grossman's own apostasy. We find the same vital concern for man as in Marx and Lenin, but with the key difference that man is not an abstract entity. Man is recognised as living flesh with all the contradictions and weakness which stem from that. Apolitical, blind and dumb, dobrota ennobles man because it takes cognizance of his weakness, of the intrinsic richness of human character and societies. Ample room exists for the indefinable and unknowable. Life's diversity is welcomed, not feared:

Все живое - неповторимо, немислимо тождество двух людей,
двух костов шиповника... Жизнь гложет там, где насилие
стремится стереть ее своеобразие и особенности.¹⁷²

Grossman's reluctance to use the word God reflects an inner struggle which he was never fully able to resolve. A scientific mind,

despite the patent and murderous failures of secular ideologies, could not totally accept the philosophical and intellectual implications inherent in the word God. To quote a source used by Lipkin:

Гроссман писатель и ученый по натуре. Есть великий, потрясающий миг в духовной жизни человека науки: восторг перед грандиозным внутренним миром материи и одновременно перед загадочным соответствием между духом человеческим и таинственной реальностью Вселенной. 173

This is indeed the threshold of prayer. Granted this explanation, we are better able to understand the nature of Grossman's predicament. The upheavals of the thirties destroyed any faith in Marx or Lenin. The Holocaust demonstrated the illusion of divine beneficence, the collapse of theodicy. Ikonnikov-Morzh's testament constitutes a solution to the failure of Marxism-Leninism and of God.

Yet here is an argument fraught with inconsistencies. Throughout Grossman's prose one notices the idea of fate or destiny. Sud'ba is by far the most important term he uses in this connection, but in earlier works near synonyms such as: udel, sluchay, dolya, uchast', and rok, are often found. That sud'ba should become the favoured word is not fortuitous. Etymologically sud'ba implies judgement, and the connotations of the Day of Judgement - strashnyy sud in Russian - accord very closely with the style and spirit of Morzh's testament. In its preface they are explicit:

Приходит пора страшного суда, о добре и зле задумываются не только философы и проповедники, и все люди, грамотные и безграмотные. 174

In this respect the English translation of sud'ba falls short. Connotations of judgement would be immediately apparent to the Russian reader, but they are lost in English translation. Greek or Scandinavian mythology comes to mind, providing us with a context in which the individual is powerless. This view has found some support among German critics, who have suggested that fate for Grossman was, . . . 'das Hereinbrechen einer unheilvollen, vernichtenden Macht, die sich in seiner Epoche im totalitären Staat manifestierte'. 175 This is partly true. Equally misleading is the German translation of fate, Schicksal. 176 It, too, fails to convey the notion of judgement, which is so overwhelming in the Russian. English and German translations of

the term strongly imply that the individual has little room to manoeuvre. Yet in Zhizn' i sud'ba individuals do have choices, often terrible, but choices nevertheless. Authoritarian leaders and the zero option of freedom move towards one another asymptotically. Enslavement is never total. Judgement is only meaningful if man exercises his volition. The very title of the novel tends to support this argument: life and fate/judgement are inseparable. Strikingly prescient and confirmatory here is the assertion in "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam" that: 'и жизнь, и судьба людская'. 177 Thus in the many sub-plots of Zhizn' i sud'ba individuals are called upon to make moral as well as ethical judgements. Novikov, Ikonnikov-Morzh, Ershov, Levinton, Shtrum are obvious examples. Others such as Krymov, Abarchuk and Mostovskoy are judged according to their own political faiths.

At this level these two strands of the judgement theme are conceptually sound. Others are less so. In view of Morzh's rejection of God it is pertinent to enquire whether the concept of justice implicit in sud'ba is theistic or secular in origin. What form of judgement can it be that leads to the Holocaust? To accept judgement here is to move perilously close to its vindication as retribution for deicide. Grossman seeks to resolve this dilemma by arguing that man himself created the conditions enabling the crematoria. As he points out in "Treblinskiy ad":

тот или иной тип государства не сваливается на людей с неба, материальные и идейные отношения народов рожают государственный строй. 178

Here too there are problems. In accepting this apparently classic Marxist position, that milieu, rather than the individual is responsible, can one legitimately impute responsibility to any one individual or group? Is justice meaningful without free will? Grossman seems to have ignored this possibility. He argues that responsibility and the question of punishment are self-evident. Legal pedantry is superfluous:

...в определении непосредственных участников фашистских убийств и преступлений суд объединенных наций обойдется без философских споров на тему о свободе воле. 179

Similarly, concepts of fate pervade Grossman's evaluation of the

victory at Stalingrad.¹⁸⁰ If the victory was predetermined, what room is there for human agency? From examination of the Stalingrad sketches, Za pravoe delo and Zhizn' i sud'ba we know the answer. Judgement implies that the Holocaust can be understood within theodicy and thus accepted as a terrible but somehow comprehensible event. This is inconsistent with the belief on the other hand that man is the architect of his own destiny. This antithesis accentuates two further problems. The rational mind demands an answer to such evil. Is the search futile? Finally it leaves us in no doubt as to the sterility of Marxist-Leninist ideology to confront the question of good and evil in the widest and deepest sense, since it denies their essential duality. Here begins, but by no means ends, man's crisis of evil in the twentieth century.

Other critics have found no serious shortcomings in Morzh's testament. Its power derives not from its intellectual strength, but from the bitter, personal tragedy which informs it. To quote G. Pomerants:

Записки Иконникова нельзя критиковать как систему, где есть неточности или ошибки. Это крик сердца... И крик вешего сердца.¹⁸¹

Whether we accept the testament as the 'философия Гроссмана'¹⁸² or as his 'ethische Lebensbilanz'¹⁸³ it is not a model for government. In fact it views all forms of government with profound suspicion. All to varying degrees, rely on coercion. Underlying Morzh's testament is a quietist, anarchic assertion of human dignity. However, the case for suggesting a Christian influence here remains strong. Morzh values highly the truth expressed in the sixth-century by Christian moralists: 'осуди грех и прости грешника'.¹⁸⁴

Closely associated with this philosophy are the personal fate of Lt Peter Bach and his eventual rejection of National Socialism. Seduced by Hitler's demagogy, Bach believes in the dream of conquest, the right of the strong to subjugate the weak. In a wider context, he symbolises the corruption of German cultural values, and the eagerness with which German intellectuals fatally compromised themselves. It is surely no coincidence that he bears the name Bach, one of Germany's great composers, a name associated with Germany's artistic achievements, not its barbarism. The reference to Beethoven in the

Stalingrad sketches makes a similar point. Likewise the choice of first name is significant. It suggests the corruption of Christian morality, an assault upon its foundations, above all in the abnegation of absolute values and the descent into moral relativism.

Signs of Bach's conversion to Hitlerism are evident in Za pravoe delo. Initially, he is sceptical of the Nazis, but in the early days of the Stalingrad battle, with a German victory almost certain, his perception of Hitler changes:

Но вот я дошел до Волги! В этом марше больше логики, чем в книгах. Человек, который провел Германию через русские поля и леса, который перешагнул через Буг, Березину, Днепр и Дон — теперь-то я знаю, кто он. Вот это я понял... То, что дремало в туманных страницах: « По ту сторону добра и зла », в « Закате Европы », в Фихте, — все это сегодня марширует на земных полях... 185

Metaphorically, the rivers are moral thresholds and with every subsequent violation bestial amorality becomes more deeply entrenched. Constant victory dazzles Bach. For him it confers legitimacy on Hitler's philosophy.

The possibilities envisaged by Nietzsche seem to be within reach: 'Но здесь на Волге ничто не казалось недозволенным'. 186 Bach's diaries are even more explicit on this theme:

Категории добра и зла способны взаимно превращаться, они формы одной сущности... С сегодняшнее преступление — фундамент завтрашней добродетели. 187

The 'forms of a single essence' is the precise term used by Liss to characterise the affinity of Germany and the Soviet Union. Similarly, the belief that good can be constructed on the basis of evil is the very ethos against which Morzh rebels. Defeat breaks the hypnotic spell cast by Hitler. Bach's subsequent conversion and reevaluation of his part in Germany's crimes has a profoundly spiritual and moral dimension. Fellow officers seem less concerned. Lenard expresses regret that they have missed an opportunity. His allusion to Spengler speaks for itself: 'Вот он, закат, гаснет, уходит мечта'. 188

Central to Bach's moral regeneration is his relationship with Zina, a Russian girl, who befriends him while he is wounded. It is her love which redeems him:

Он полюбил ее. Стены, воздвигнутые государствами, расовая ярость, огневой вал тяжелой артиллерии ничего не значат, бессильны перед силой любви... И он благодарен судьбе, которая накануне гибели дала ему это понимание. 189

Bach's salvation through love, and his return to humanity follow the path trodden by Raskolnikov. Like Dostoevskiy's hero he is subverted by visions of the superman, by the belief that nothing is forbidden. He is a man playing with a terrible idea. Zina, like Sonya, is the spirit of forgiveness and compassion. Unable to accompany Bach into captivity, she will, through her love, provide him with spiritual succour during the privations ahead.

III

Vse techet falls into two distinct, yet inseparable parts. The first part is a narrative which concerns itself with the cost of the Stalin years. The second part is an extraordinarily concentrated exposition of Russia's milliennial history. It is here that Grossman seeks an answer to Russia's perennial tragedy. Central to the narrative is the fate of Ivan Grigorievich, who after nearly thirty years in various camps, returns to the Moscow of his student days. Occurring in the mid fifties, his return is richly and diversely symbolic: it is a confrontation of past and present; it examines the relationship between betrayed and betrayer, sinner and sin; and at its deepest level it evolves into a mystical revelation of man's goodness and his desire for freedom. Resurrected from the house of the dead, and now once again among his vilifiers and betrayers, Ivan by his very presence embodies judgement and, for some, redemption.

Past and present are brought together in a series of meetings. Nikolay Andreevich, Ivan's cousin, is anxious at the news of Ivan's release and impending arrival. He is concerned that it will jeopardise his chances of election to the Academy of Sciences. The real cause lies deeper. Ivan's release signifies a change in official policy. The past is attempting to catch up with the present. Despite his modest professional success Nikolay is resentful of others' achievements. Nor can he tolerate respect being accorded to those from dubious social backgrounds. The tensions at the time of the

Doctors' Plot are not all to his disadvantage. Betraying the sceptical, questioning ethos of the scientist, Nikolay accepts the alleged treachery and perfidy of Jewish scientists and doctors. Wilful deception originates from a fear of considering other possibilities:

Если они не виноваты, а признали себя виноватыми, надо предполагать другое преступление, еще более ужасное, чем то, в котором их обвиняли, - преступление против них. 190

Recognition of this imposes an obligation to act.

Stalin's death, the shock of which is compared to the news of the German invasion, and the revelations that the Doctors' Plot was a fabrication, initiates the collapse of Nikolay's protective edifice, his sanctuary from the true nature of Soviet reality. From under the rubble he sees a very different picture of his life:

Да, да, в преклонении, в великом послушании прошла его жизнь, в страхе перед голодом, пыткой, сибирской каторгой. 191

Comforting silence is shattered. Nikolay curses the state for its admissions: 'Лучше бы молчало! оно не имело права признаться'. 192

Ivan's difficulties and subsequent incarceration owed nothing to the notorious 'fifth point', the fifth paragraph on official forms relating to nationality. Though real enough, Grossman shrewdly avoids the nationality question with regard to Ivan: 'Неудачная, горькая судьба Ивана зависела от Ивана'. 193 The central underlying theme is freedom. Unwilling to be manipulated, Ivan openly attacks the encroaching dictatorship while at university. Expelled, he is exiled for three years, eventually rearrested and forced to serve a longer term.

The divide between Ivan and Nikolay is insuperable. Communication for both men is an ordeal. Unintentional, Nikolay's brash insensitivity reflects the absence of a common language. In the presence of Nikolay, Ivan cannot talk about his experiences or lost comrades. Of course Nikolay is an outsider, but the true reasons for this are not immediately apparent:

...и даже самое нежное, самое тихое и доброе слово о них было бы, как прикосновение шершавой, тупой руки к обнажившемуся, растерзанному сердцу. Нельзя было касаться

их. 194

Nikolay's tears of welcome and protestations of mutual suffering are the twin product of years of self-duplicity and guilt. There is something quite unreal, almost grotesque, in his mental turmoil, as he mentally strives to convince Ivan and himself that life outside the camps was every bit as bad:

« Ваня, Ванечки, дико, странно, но я завидую тебе, завидую тому, что в страшном лагере ты не должен был подписывать подлых писем, не голосовал за смертную казнь невинным, не вступал с подлыми речами »... 195

The perverse fallacy needs no rebuttal. Ivan's taciturnity and his resistance to the material blandishments provided by Nikolay and his wife are perceived as criticism. Nikolay no longer feels able to confess his past to Ivan, whose presence now seems, . . . 'чужой, недобрый, враждебный'. 196 Ivan, Nikolay feels, has come to judge and then to 'erase' his life. Yet Nikolay judges himself. His discomfort at Ivan's silence is the assertion of conscience, the moral reckoning, which he attempts to mollify by talk. Nikolay's long monologue concerning events and personalities unknown to Ivan is an indirect path to recognition of his own complicity.

Thus Nikolay seeks to legitimise the campaign against the 'cosmopolitans'. It did not mark a new purge, similar to that in thirties, euphemistically expressed as a 'процесс замены' 197, but rather represents the triumph of Russian nationalism in science. According to Nikolay, scientific achievements provide the basis for political hegemony:

...и этой суверенности должна соответствовать суверенность политическая - русское вошло в область содержания, в базис, в фундамент... 198

This is the language of personal and state justification of the worst possible kind. Those individuals who were 'cast out' - Grossman uses the verb vyshibat - failed to see that this was the 'закономерность истории'. 199 Likewise, Nikolay is contemptuous of those scientists who saw the campaign as an expression of state-sponsored Judeophobia, rather than the foundation of a national science. Nikolay's prevarication, his use of clichés and most certainly his endorsement of Lysenko, the great shaman of Soviet science, who with his bogus

teachings severely impeded the progress of Soviet science, all damn him. Infinitely wise and cast in the role of confessant, Ivan listens to Nikolay in eloquent silence:

На него смотрели внимательные глаза Ивана Григорьевича, и в душе Николая Андреевича шевельнулась тревога, такая, какая бывала в детстве, когда чувствуешь на себе грустный взгляд материнских глаз и неясно ощущаешь, что не так надо, не по-хорошему говоришь. 200

In Vitaliy Pinegin, now a successful scientist, Ivan confronts his denouncer. Satisfied that Ivan does not know of his treachery, he is conscious of an inexplicable sense of gratitude. However, nothing remains hidden from Ivan. The 'sad curiosity' with which he regards Pinegin and his offer of financial help shows that he has cast a glance into the shallows of Pinegin's soul and seen his secret. Pinegin suddenly understands this. Though fleeting, the moment of reckoning is unendurable:

...и Пинегину на секунду, только на одну секунду, даже не на две, показалось: и ордена, и дачу, и власть, и силу, и красавицу-жену, и удачных сыновей, изучающих ядро атома, - все, все можно отдать, лишь бы не чувствовать на себе этого взгляда. 201

The effects of this reckoning are impermanent. Exposure is Pinegin's biggest nightmare and Grossman compares Ivan's silent condemnation with being caught stealing in the presence of a social inferior. Furthermore, despite Pinegin's admission that his life is 'сплошная подлость' 202 and ought to have been lived differently, the customs and privileges of his milieu emphatically manifest themselves. The change in mood is dramatic. In his favourite restaurant Pinegin is flattered and courted by the staff, who see in his clothes, self-assurance and deputy's badge, all the signs of authority and status. Pinegin is conscious of a feeling of power, of being close to the centre of decision-making:

Он шел между столиками с флажками многих держав мира, и казалось, что это линкоры и крейсера, а он флагман-адмирал, принимающий парад. 203

The scene is almost Gogolian. Yet any humour is overshadowed by Pinegin's treachery. Access to the world of power and material well-

being serves two functions for Pinegin. Not only are they felt to be intrinsically desirable, but they provide a soothing justification for the past. The rituals of social hierarchy, flattery in the select restaurant, and Pinegin's perception of himself as a wielder of power are all part of the 'чувство адмиральства' 204, which help him to live and to overcome Ivan's ghost. Amid this comfort and material security the doubts which afflict Pinegin's sense of righteousness are laid to rest.

Confession and repentance beckon both Nikolay and Pinegin, but both lack the moral autonomy to follow. In justifying the past and present, they justify themselves. Unlike Nikolay and Pinegin, Anna Sergeevna, the woman with whom Ivan lives and shares a painfully brief relationship, has no fear when confronted with his past experience and moral stature. In fact it is the need to confess which attracts her to Ivan. He is her lover, and a living symbol of Russia's lost generations; he is also her confessant, and as such is identified with Christ:

А я смотрю на тебя, ты не сердись, как на Христа. Все
хочется перед тобой. как перед Богом, каяться. 205

Anna Sergeevna's confession details her involvement in the destruction of the kulaks and the establishment of the collective farms. It is a case study in totalitarian methodology. Violence in print precedes the physical violence. The kulaks are variously portrayed as bloodsuckers, vicious and corrupt exploiters and enemies of the people. Sceptical as she is, Anna Sergeevna finds it impossible to resist the incessant barrage of hate, the savage imprecations hurled at the peasantry:

на меня тоже стали эти слова действовать девчонка совсем,
а тут и на собрании, и специальный инструктаж, и по радио
передают, и в кино показывают, и писатели пишут, и сам
Сталин, все в одну точку: кулаки - паразиты, хлеб жгут,
детей убивают и прямо объявили поднимать ярость масс против
них, уничтожать их всех как класс, проклятых...и я стала
околдовываться, и все кажется: вся беда от кулаков, и если
уничтожить их сразу для крестьянства счастливое время
наступит. 206

The concerted attacks mounted against the kulaks bear witness to

the awesome power to shape opinion enjoyed by the totalitarian state's media. In a society striving for universal literacy the potential was still greater. Commenting on this point in Vse techet, Mikhail Heller has observed:

Vasily Grossman hit on the precise word to describe the state of a Soviet person subjected to intensive ideological processing: bewitched. 207

The deluge of propaganda is not only necessary to create an atmosphere of universal hostility towards the given enemy, it also vindicates the prophetic powers of the leader, who has earlier hinted at his intention to deal with the peasants. Thus, when the time comes to even the score with the class enemies, . . . 'prophecy becomes a retrospective alibi'. 208

Mass starvation is Anna Sergeevna's most harrowing recollection of Stalin's war against the peasantry. Deprived of his equipment, with all his supplies of grain and seed seized by the party activists, the peasant simply starved to death. In this parlous state he is no longer an exploitable commodity and thus ceases to be of any interest to the Party. The state's attitude is brutally expedient:

Раз с человека держава взять ничего не может, - он становится бесполезным. Зачем его учить да лечить? 209

Worst hit are the children, whose wasted bodies and pitiful cries torment their parents even more than their own hunger does. Such is the power of propaganda and Stalin's persona that Anna Sergeevna agonises over the question of his involvement and responsibility:

Неужели Сталин хуже Ирода был. Неужели, думаю, хлеб за зерно отнял, а потом убил людей голодом. Нет, не может такого быть. А потом думаю: было, было! И тут же - нет, не могло того быть. 210

Equally indicted are the venal press and, in particular, Maxim Gorky. In the midst of such slaughter his articles on children's education are obscenely irrelevant, even more so when he remained silent as to the fate of Russian village life. One wonders, to what degree, if at all, Grossman indicts his own silence here. Like his literary sponsor, he appears to have ignored the question, at least in public. However, the publication of "Malen'kaya zhizn'" and "Molodaya i staraya" in the sixties show that in fact he did broach the subject.

Moreover, criticism of Gorky, the first head of the Union of Writers, is addressed to Soviet writers as a whole. Through their mendacious articles and books they helped to conceal the scale of the murder from the outside world. They willingly and elaborately fostered the 'heroic lie'.²¹¹ Vse techet tells the sordid and ugly truth of how millions disappeared. As Anna Sergeevna realises, the dead must not be forgotten:

А где же эта жизнь, где страшная мука? Неужели ничего не осталось? Неужели никто не ответит за все это? Вот так и забудется без слов?²¹²

Grossman's commitment to tell the truth about the fate of the peasantry in Vse techet is as strong as his commitment to reveal the full extent of the Holocaust in "Treblinskiy ad" and Zhizn' i sud'ba.

Underlying Grossman's documentation of psychological coercion and treachery in "Molodaya i staraya", "Los'", and "Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dney" are deeper questions of individual motivation and state culpability. Who are the denouncers? Why do they do it? Finally, what is the relationship between the state and the donoschik? Certain aspects of these questions have been answered in the earlier works. However, it is a theme of such vital importance for post-Stalinist Russia that Grossman felt compelled to pursue it much further. We find a remarkable absence of any malice in Grossman. In judging the denouncers we are constantly reminded to consider how we would have behaved had we been on the other side of the interrogator's desk.

Grossman identifies four types of donoschiki. The first Judas (Grossman's term) was himself arrested and spent time in the camps. On his return he is ostracised by the majority because it is believed that he cooperated with the security organs. Yet Grossman puts forward the view that some form of cooperation was inevitable. Nothing in this person's life has prepared him for the ordeal of arrest, interrogation and incarceration:

А на человека крепко нажали. На него не только кричали, его и били, и спать не давали, и пить не давали, а кормили селедочкой и стращали смертной казнью.²¹³

Grossman's second example is the sekretnyy sotrudnik or seksot, who works as an informer for the security organs. Exploiting his

friendships and intimacy with others, he uses the knowledge as the basis for denunciations. Fearful of his bourgeois origins, he denounces others to demonstrate loyalty to the new regime.

The third type is peculiar to the Soviet system. Of worker or peasant origins, he seems to have the perfect credentials to advance himself. His flaw is envy. He is jealous of the Party's founding fathers, their achievements and prestige. The Terror offered an opportunity to eliminate this disparity:

В 1937 году человек этот слету, смаху написал больше двухсот доносов. Многообразен его кровавый список. 214

To this type belongs Chepetnikov. Among the occupations of his many victims we find commissars of the Civil War period and non-party engineers, who are redolent of Lobyshev and Nikolay respectively in 'Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dney'. This third type appears to be least deserving of sympathy. But even here Grossman advocates caution before we pass judgement:

Но нет, нет, не следует спешить, надо разобраться, подумать прежде чем произносить приговор. Ибо не ведал он, что творил. 215

The final caveat, an allusion to St Luke's gospel (23:34), is consistent with Ikonnikov-Morzh's testament. To understand the sinner we must understand the nature of the sin.

The Party deliberately encouraged the Chepetnikovs. It tempted them with undreamt-of status, power and wealth. The Party exploited the latent resentment between young and old, securing loyalty to Stalin based on privilege. But with the promise of power came the threat of destruction:

Партия кричала на него, топала на него сталинскими сапогами: « Если ты проявишь нерешительность, то поставишь себя в один ряд с выродками и я сотру тебя в порошок! Помни сукин сын, ту черную избу, в которой ты родился, а я веду тебя к свету: чти послушание, Великий Сталин, отец твой, приказывают тебе: 'Ату их'! ». 216

Grossman's allusion to Luke's gospel differs in the quotation of the verb 'to know'. The Russian New Testament uses znat', whereas Grossman uses the verb vedat', a verb with connotations of leading and knowing. The two are closely related in the traditions of the

Orthodox Church: one is led to knowledge. Haranguing his subjects, Stalin, the former seminarist, usurps this dual relationship. As the nation's elder he demands obedience, claiming to be the sole guide to light. Thus the templates of religion lend themselves particularly well to the Soviet variety of totalitarianism, a relationship which Grossman explores in later chapters.

Fanatical greed predominates in the fourth type of Judas. Impervious to human companionship, this type sees the Terror as an opportunity to acquire material goods and advantages. This obsession, suggests Grossman, reflects the failure of the state to guarantee a reasonable standard of living. Overcrowded apartments, insanitary exteriors and poor food - the lot of the Soviet majority - have brutalised him. Hence Grossman asks: 'He от звериной ли жизни озверел он?'.²¹⁷ But not all succumbed to such pressures.

It is the Party as much as the donoschiki and seksoty who are on trial in Grossman's courtroom scenario. Personal guilt presupposes some freedom of action. The accused argue that this was illusory. The state had already determined those to be destroyed. Their denunciations were 'для внешнего обрамления'.²¹⁸ Even in cases where the informers did not fulfil this dubious function and apparently nominated their victims, the state's guiding hand was ubiquitous:

Доносчики и Сексоты:

Эта наша свобода выбора кажущаяся. Люди уничтожались методом статистическим, к истреблению готовились лишь люди, принадлежащие к определенным социальным и идейным слоям. Мы знали эти параметры, ведь бы их тоже знали. Мы никогда не стучали на людей, принадлежащих к здоровому слою, не подлежавшему уничтожению.²¹⁹

The simplicity of this answer is too beguiling. If membership of class determines guilt, and the state determines the nature of class, why are the donoschiki and seksoty necessary? The extent to which individuals denounced others, even when the victims were already doomed, was a manifestation of faith in the Party, in Stalin. Complicity in Stalin's crimes bound people more effectively than did rank and privilege.

Outright condemnation or absolution of the individual are impossible. The relationship between the individual and the

totalitarian state was one in which the, . . . 'животная, растительная, минеральная, физико-химическая сторона человека' 220 could only grow and proliferate. Qualities which enoble man's existence were mercilessly crushed. But this, argues the defending judge, is what makes the phenomenon of the stukach so terrible:

Они любят науку, великую русскую литературу, прекрасную музыку, смело и умно некоторые из них судят о самых сложных явлениях современной философии, искусства... 221

State structures cannot be entirely blamed for individual atavism:

Стукачи проросли из человека. Жаркий пар госстраха пропарил люской род, и дремавшие зернышки взбухли, пожили.

Государство - земля. Если в земле не затаились зерна, не вырастет из земли ни пшеницы, ни бурьян. Человек обязан лично себе за мразь человеческую. 222

Expiation of guilt is only possible through acknowledgement of individual responsibility in the monstrous web of lies. To hold the state solely responsible offers an attractive solution to personal guilt. However, it leaves a nagging and disconcerting question in its wake. If the stukachi were mere cogs in the machinery of repression, if the very notion of guilt has no meaning, why, asks Grossman, does the obscenity of human conduct (человеческое непотребство 223) arouse such pain and shame?

Had Vse techet been published in the sixties, the camp theme alone would have been sufficient to have made it one of the most sensational and divisive works of the period. Never incarcerated, Grossman undoubtedly acquired much of the detail of the camps from ex-prisoners, many of whom were released for service at the front. These details provide merely the framework of the work. The substance of it is pure Grossman, and represents a triumph of his sensitive imagination and his unerring powers of empathy.

The psychology of survival is one of the most fascinating and instructive features of the camp theme in Vse techet. Huge numbers of prisoners stubbornly cling to the notion that their arrest is a mistake. They nurture a blind faith in authority, convinced that in the Soviet Union, . . . 'зря не сажают'. 224 So strong is the belief in Party infallibility among certain prisoners that their arrest is considered to be a justified act. One prisoner, a former member of

the Comintern, has no doubts:

Он все же принадлежит к слою, враждебному партии, слою,
порождающему двурушников, троцкистов, оппортунистов
на практике, нытников, и маловеров. 225

Similar sentiments are voiced by a former party activist:

лес рубят, щепки летят, а партийная правда остается правдой.
Она выше моей беды. 226

Of the many people whom Ivan meets in the camps only an exceedingly small number have actively struggled against Soviet power. Barya Romashkin is the sole active enemy whom Ivan meets. Indication of just how widely the concept of objective guilt has been applied can be seen from the fact that during his interrogation large numbers of high-ranking officers and officials came to see him. Such fascination for a lone offender would tend to suggest the rarity of real opposition. This is partly due to the appeal of the Revolution and its goals. Those arrested are faced with an unwelcome dilemma: either they recognise their 'errors', and remain intellectually, if not physically within the Party; or they renounce the Party, and become in effect Ishmaels. Individuals, imprisoned on some spurious accusation or on the denunciation of an informer, were quick to see an error in their own case, but were harshly dismissive of the tribulations of others.

A prisoner's ethical, spiritual and philosophical frame of mind tended to reside in the particular era of his arrest. Change and the outside world seemed no longer to exist. Grossman contrasts this consistency of attitude to the all too compliant behaviour of those outside the camps. He suggests that this frame of mind is due to a form of amnesia. Yet how vast is the difference? For those behind the wire memories are their sole inviolate possession. Survival in the camps owes as much to belief in something as it does to the physical necessities of food and warmth. Loyalty to a given era is a response to imprisonment. Those who live beyond the wire adapt themselves to those in authority, fearing the consequences of individuality, freedom of thought and expression. What is more, many are not aware of the subtle, imperceptible process whereby they imbibe and then themselves transmit the demands of higher authority. Both groups are victims of totalitarianism.

No allowances were made for women. In the fate of Masha we see the full and appalling effects of prison life on a young and sensitive mother. For Grossman the fate of women in the camps is not only a powerful symbol of the physical debasement of Russia, but of the very life force itself:

Все в женщине - ее нежность, ее заботливость, ее страсть,
ее материнство - хлеб и вода жизни. 227

Arrested for failing to denounce her husband, Masha, despite her optimism, disappears into the grey morass of suffering humanity in the camps. In addition to gruelling labour, Masha has to contend with the sexual predation of both men and women; and it is here that Grossman breaks one of the most sensitive of Soviet taboos. Subject to prolonged and artificial separation from one another, men and women turn to homosexuality. For Grossman this is a further debasement of Russian womanhood:

на карторге женщины принуждали женщин к неестественному
сожительству. В женских картожных бараках создавались
нелепые характеры - женщины коблы, с сипатыми голосами, с
размашистой походкой, с мужскими замашками, в брюках,
заправленных в солдатские сапоги. А рядом потерянные
жалкие существа - ковырялки. 228

The conditions of women prisoners, as described by Grossman, suggest that in some respects women fared much worse than men. Women are reduced to beasts of burden, as implied in the various similes of 'верблюдница', 'ослица' and 'кобыла' 229. Equality there is, but of a different kind:

...Равноправие женщин с мужчиной утверждено не на кафедрах
и не в трудах социологов... оно утверждено в истории России
ныне, присно и во веки веков крепостным, лагерным, эшелонным,
тюремным страданием. 230

Hopes of freedom and the possibility that she might be reunited with her husband and child never entirely desert Masha. The brutal destruction of her hopes comes from a quite unexpected source. On a work party Masha catches a tantalizing, and for her fatal, glance of the life enjoyed by the camp administrators: she sees a young girl returning home from school who reminds Masha and her companions of what they have lost. They can adapt to physical privation, but memory

is more stubborn. The poignancy of this vision is exacerbated by the strains of dance music. For Masha it is a turning point. It is an excruciating reminder of her loss, articulating the otherwise unutterable and boundless depths of loneliness and despair:

Под эту веселую танцевальную музыку Маша навсегда потеряла надежду увидеть Юлю, затерянную среди приемников, коллекторов, колоний, детдомов, в громаде Союза Советских Социалистических Республик. Под веселую музыку танцевали ребята в общежитиях и клубах. И Маша поняла, что мужа ее нет нигде, он расстрелян, она уже никогда не увидит его. 231

Grossman assaults the Lenin myth from three standpoints. There is an attack on Lenin the man, his position in Russian history, and finally an onslaught on Lenin's philosophy.

Uniqueness is essential for sainthood. Yet Grossman suggests that many features of Lenin's Weltanschauung are to be found in other political and religious fanatics. Lenin combines the abstract love of humanity in general with contempt for the individual in particular. Obsessed with political abstractions, Lenin nurtures a deep and unrelenting hatred for those who deviate from his tenets. His willingness to trample on today's freedom in the name of tomorrow's perfection places him firmly in the mould of Pestel, Bakunin and Nechaev. For Lenin, theory becomes a terrible weapon, and as Grossman implies, Lenin becomes its physical embodiment, a conjunction, which we have frequently encountered before: 'Хирургический нож - великий теоретик, философский лидер двадцатого века'. 232 Lenin's fanaticism impinges on his intellectual objectivity, often claimed by fellow travellers to be one of the outstanding hallmarks of Leninist philosophy. Lenin, Grossman argues, did not seek to convince his opponents in reasoned debate. As with many seasoned demagogues, his appeal was to his audience. Truth was a by-product, an expedient casualty in the battle for psychological and ideological hegemony: 'Ленин в споре не искал истины, он искал победы'. 233

Lenin's mental profile is indistinguishable from that of Lev Mekler, one of the Revolution's many Jesuits. Mekler's fanaticism is total. The Revolution is a religious crusade:

Он был проповедником, апостолом и бойцом всемирной социалистической революции. Ради революции он, не

колеблясь, был готов отдать свою жизнь. 234

Grossman's portrait of the revolutionary mentality is remarkably consistent with what he have seen in "Chetyre dnya". Thirty years later the malignant potential of these political genes had been fully realised.

Grotesque contradictions, even paradox, are to be found in the Lenin/Mekler mentality. We are presented with a man who is moved by service to his fellow man, an individual committed to a better world yet one who is covered in the blood of others. The revolutionary pursues an unsullied idea. Aware of an imperfect world he is driven to excesses greater than those he has declared himself determined to eradicate. Mankind has to be beaten and kicked to happiness. The net result is still greater 'imperfection' and still greater vengeful fury as the goal eludes the revolutionary fanatic. Hatred and negation motivate him. No longer a means to an end, violence becomes an end in itself. Stripped of its maudlin enthusiasm and reduced to its ugly monotony, this violence is the single all-consuming passion of Varnavitskiy in "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam". Not unexpectedly Mekler falls victim to the concentric waves of negation stemming from the Revolution's centre.

Grossman compares Mekler's total devotion to the Revolution with that of a dog to its master. Even in death it remains loyal:

И при последних смертных хрипах своих, удушенная веревкой,
она смотрела на хозяина с кротостью и любовью, с верой,
равной той что вела на смерть первых мучеников-христиан. 235

Identification with the Christian martyrs is suitably apposite. In dying Mekler assumes the guilt of the weaker members of the cause, and his death becomes an ideological parody of Christian crucifixion. Grossman finds the same religiosity in Lenin, who in his unyielding faith is a contemporary manifestation of the Old Believer Petrovich Avvakum.

Grossman's second attack is historical. To understand Lenin's role we must see him within the context of Russia's long and bloody history, above all in her absence of freedom, and in the myth of the Russian soul. It is here that Grossman sharply diverges from the major thinkers of the nineteenth century. He rejects the belief, advanced by such diverse writers as Chaadaev, Gogol, Belinsky and

Dostoevsky that Russia's destiny was to lead the world:

Ей, русской душе, и пророчили пророки великое и светлое будущее. они сходились на том, что в душе русских идея христианства воплощена в безгосударственной аскетической, византийской, антизападной форме... Эти пророчества сильнейших умов и сердец России объединились одной общей им роковой чертой.

Все они видели силу русской души, прозревали ее значение для мира, но не видели они, что особенности русской души не свободы, что русская душа - тысячелетняя раба. Что даст миру тысячелетняя раба, пусть и ставшая всеильной?236

Numerous examples elsewhere in Grossman contradict his contentions here; the exploits of the Stalingradtsy, Ikonnikov-Morzh, not to mention Ivan himself. Yet the point is telling. Despite the industrialisation and modernisation of Russia, the parallels with the West are superficial. They obscure a fundamental difference:

...развитие Запада оплодотворялось ростом свободы, а развитие России оплодотворялось ростом рабства.237

Grossman modifies Engels' claim: freedom is not a 'осознанная необходимость', but a result of man's political and moral development, a 'преоделенная необходимость'.238 Human history progresses according to the extent to which it confers greater freedom. Hence progress may be defined as moving from a state of less freedom to greater freedom. As Grossman puts it: 'Эволюция жизни есть эволюция свободы'.239

Judged by this all-important criterion, the Russian Revolution instigated by Lenin was a manifest failure. To use Grossman's distinctly Orwellian neologism it was the triumph of 'unfreedom' (несвобода 240). Slavery and bondage based on the system of serfdom are now replaced by the twentieth-century equivalent: serfdom in the kolkhoz and factory. One set of autocrats has replaced another. The fruits of science which promised so much furthered the process of enslavement:

Так тысячелетней цепью были прикованы друг к другу прогресс и русское рабство. Каждый порыв к свету углублял черную яму крепостничества.241

Soviet mythology holds that the Great October Revolution was the culmination of the people's natural aspirations, and was inspired,

inter alia, by the ideals of Marx, and brought to fruition by the skill of Lenin. Grossman's iconoclasm offers a different view. He suggests that the most significant revolution occurred not in 1917, but in 1861. Far from continuing and consolidating the freedoms gained under the Tsars, 1917 turned the clock back. In the language of Marxism-Leninism it was retrogressive, not progressive. Abolition of serfdom renounced a principle, hitherto sacrosanct, . . . 'связь прогресса с крепостничеством'.²⁴² 1917 restored this link, ensuring that Soviet advances in industry, agriculture and science were once again based on the enslavement of large sections of the population.

In the Russian context Grossman defines a revolution as something which seeks to eradicate Russia's 'рабская душа'.²⁴³ Lenin achieved a result diametrically opposed to that intended:

И так сложилось, что революционная одержимость, фанатическая вера в истинность Марксизма-Ленинизма, полная нетерпимость к инакомыслящим привели к тому, что Ленин способствовал колоссальному развитию той России, которую он ненавидел всеми силами своей фанатической души.²⁴⁴

Moreover, his influence was not confined to Russia. The October Revolution, the triumph of slavery, became a, . . . 'факелом, освещающим новые пути человечества'.²⁴⁵ The Leninist 'синтез несвободы с социализмом'²⁴⁶ laid the foundations for Mussolini and Hitler's 'новый порядок'.²⁴⁷ Lenin redefined the raison d'etre of the state with catastrophic consequences for the world:

Нации и государства могут развиваться во имя силы и вопреки свободе!.²⁴⁸

Had Grossman's devastating criticisms confined themselves to Marx, Lenin and Stalin, he might have found greater support for his views among those who certainly regard Lenin as a dictator, but one belonging to a new genus, a ghastly mutation, rather than to an established pattern. In arguing that Lenin is the latest in a long line of Russian autocrats Grossman undermines other great names of the past. Tsarist and Soviet autocracy are strikingly linked in a scene borrowed from Pushkin's Mednyy Vsadnik. Ivan finds a deep and unshakable relationship between Peter the Great and the consequences of 1917:

Казалось ни тридцать лет назад и сто тридцать лет назад,

когда Пушкин привел на эту лошадь своего героя, не был дивный Петр так велик, как сегодня. 249

Classical Marxism assures us that the state apparatus will wither away. Yet Lenin ensured that the state assumed powers undreamt of in Peter's day:

Она росла, поднималась, царила над полями, над фабриками, над письменными столами поэтов и ученых, над стройками каналов и плотин, над каменоломнями, над лесозаводами и лесосеками, - в своем могучестве способная обладать и громадой пространства, и сокровенными глубинами сердец зачарованного человека, несущего ей в дар свою свободу, саможелания свободы. 250

Even St Petersburg has sinister connotations for Ivan, reminding him of the disinfection centre (sanpropusknik) in the camps where the illness of freedom is cured:

Эти слова нелепо сошлись, выражая связь между великим всадником и лагерным оборванцем. 251

Grossman's criticisms are not confined to the autocrats or ideologues of Russia's history. Writers, whether they could be classified as Slavophiles, such as Dostoevskiy and Gogol, or Westerners, such as Turgenev and Belinskiy, have misconstrued the mysticism of the Russian soul; it is a manifestation of slavery. Grossman singles out Dostoevskiy:

Да где она, « русская душа » - « всечеловеческая и всесоединяющая », которой предсказывал Достоевский « изречь окончательное слово великой общей гармонии, братского окончательного согласия всех племен по Христову евангельскому закону » ? 252

Dostoevsky's mysticism, suggests Grossman, stems not from a greater propinquity to God, but from Russia's Byzantine past. Asceticism and humility, the negation of self, and the withdrawal from the world, testify to the absence of freedom, the unfreedom which gave rise to Leninism. Grossman puts forward the provocative and original thesis that the philosophies of Lenin and Dostoevskiy have a common source. Mysticism, messianic fervour or fanatical materialism are symptoms of Russia's slavery. Dostoevsky, having brushed with the autocracy as a young man retreated into religion. Lenin usurped and led a revolution

which seized power. The common ground between the two is confirmed in Dostoevsky's fiction by his profound analysis of the revolutionary mentality. No other writer foresaw with such terrifying accuracy the consequences of twentieth-century totalitarianism, and this because Dostoevsky understood better than Lenin ever did that domination and submission are two sides of the same coin.

Few, if any interpretations, have seen Dostoevskiy in this light. Traditionally, he has been regarded as an implacable enemy of the revolutionaries, a defender of man's spirit against the ravages of materialism. That Dostoevskiy should be compared with Lenin in such a radical way is for many deeply discomfoting, even repugnant. Together with his analysis of Russia's past, especially her 'rabskaya dusha', Grossman's comparison of Dostoevskiy and Lenin helps to explain the hostile reception accorded to Vse techet among certain Russians now living in the West. For example Vladimir Maximov, the editor of Kontinent described Grossman's thoughts on Russian history as 'an openly racist declaration'.²⁵³

More balanced objections voiced by Arkadiy Stolypin are equally unfavourable. He is quick to attack the idea of Russia's slave-like soul:

Если Россия - вечная раба и ни к чему иному, чем к рабскому состоянию, не приспособлена, то, быть может, и никакой иной строй, чем тоталитарный, в нашей стране невозможен? Тогда вообще есть ли смысл против нынешнего строя бороться?²⁵⁴

Can Grossman be defended? Firstly, it should be pointed out that Grossman does not talk of Russia as an 'eternal slave', but as a 'thousand year slave' or as a 'great slave'. There is an important distinction here. Were Russia an eternal slave, all efforts to transform her might well indeed be futile. Nonetheless, a millenium is a long period in a nation's history, sufficient to form that elusive entity, the national soul/character, and Stolypin's argument is a weighty one. Secondly, it does not follow that totalitarianism is all that is possible. Rousseau's famous dictum that man is born in freedom yet everywhere he is in chains seems profoundly relevant to the Russian/Soviet experience. Yet freedom cannot be entirely eliminated. No other literature of modern times has been so obsessed with man's freedom as Russian literature. Equipped with the resources

of the state, the adherents of unfreedom are able to bring massive pressure to bear on writers. But their efforts have been spectacularly unsuccessful. That writers have waged this unequal struggle over so many generations shows that totalitarianism is not Russia's ineluctable and eternal destiny.

Furthermore, it is incorrect to suggest, as Stolypin does, that Grossman ignored totalitarianism in other states. Zhizn' i sud'ba clearly refutes that. Russian autocracy and Soviet totalitarianism are not the manifestation of an incurable flaw in the national psyche. Certain conditions, historical and geographical, have contributed to it. Grossman points out - and Stolypin ignores this - that these conditions would have had the same effect on other nations:

И пусть в эти параметры, в леса и степи, в топи и равнины, в силовое поле между Европой и Азией, в русскую трагическую огромность тысячу лет назад вросли бы французы, немцы, итальянцы, англичане - закон истории стал бы тем же, каким был закон русского движения. Да и не одни русские познали эту дорогу. Немало есть народов на всех континентах земли, которые то отдаленно, смутно, то близко, ясней в своей горечи узнавали горечь русской дороги. 255

In other areas Stolypin's criticisms are far less cogent. Lenin, he writes:

...был просто тотальным воплощением зла, чуждым русскому национальному гению, в глубине души ненавидевшим Россию. 256

For a Russian nationalist this somewhat simplified picture of Lenin is undeniably comforting. Even Grossman does not consider Lenin to be the 'total embodiment of evil'. He recognises, seeks to understand the paradox, whereby a man who loved Tolstoy and Beethoven, and wanted to create paradise on earth, instead laid the foundations for Stalin. Commenting on Grossman's overall achievement in Vse techet, Stolypin accuses him of having produced:

...сбивчивая картина, дезориентирующая малосведущих, огорчающая ревнителей нашей народной истории, могущая быть взятой на вооружение иностранными недоброжелателями нашей страны. 257

This could have easily been written by a Soviet critic. It gives some idea of the strength of the taboos which Grossman breaches in Vse

techet.

Markish has been at the centre of the argument over Grossman's alleged Russophobia. Convincingly, he contends that the heart of Grossman's attack on Lenin, chapter 22, needs to be read, . . . 'в контексте всей повести'. 258 That said there remains a

... впечатление нежности и жалости к русской судьбе и
русской истории, жалость, рожденной бесконечной любовью и
той самой « бессмысленной добротой », о которой столько
сказано в « Жизни и судьбе ». Ненависти к России нет, нет
расизма - и того менее. 259

Markish suggests that chapter 22 belongs to the second version of Vse techet, written after the arrest of Zhizn' i sud'ba. The inference here is that the 'ропечь, скепсис, пессимизм' 260, which inform the historical perspective are due to this personal tragedy. Lipkin, whom Markish cites as his source, does not in fact provide any definite information as to whether the content of chapter 22 was written before or after the seizure of the manuscripts. He records that Grossman rewrote Vse techet and that it doubled in size. 261 Notwithstanding the rewriting of Vse techet, it should be noted that Lenin is indicted as the architect of Soviet slavery on several occasions in Zhizn' i sud'ba. One particular reference was not included in either the Soviet journal or book version. 262 Nor is the historical perspective peculiar to Vse techet. It is characteristic of all Grossman's major works, as are his scepticism and pessimism.

When Vse techet was published in Oktyabr' it was prefaced by a long article, some twenty five pages, written by Professor Vodolazov, a member of the Academy of Social Sciences attached to the Central Committee of the CPSU. Other articles on the work have also appeared in the Soviet press, but to date this remains the most authoritative and well argued attempt to refute Grossman. For these reasons it will form the basis of an analysis of Soviet responses to Vse techet.

Vodolazov's aim is unequivocal. He fundamentally rejects Grossman's conception concerning the:

... причин, корней, истоков сталинизма, против отождествления
Ленина со Сталиным, а ленинизма со сталинизмом. И в этом
смысле я действительно буду защищать Ленина. 263

Grossman's factual base is unsound, he maintains, and his

interpretation of Lenin's life distorted. He cites the well known episode, when Lenin, having reached the summit of a mountain while in Swiss exile, hurls imprecations at his political enemies, rather than acknowledge the beauty of his surroundings. From this, he adds, Grossman incorrectly finds evidence of Lenin's, . . . 'узость ума, бедность чувства'.²⁶⁴ Conscious of the fact that millions of Russian soldiers are dying in World War One, Lenin has no time to appreciate beauty, or so we are led to believe. According to Vodolazov, it is Ivan Grigorevich, not Lenin who is politically narrow-minded:

Какой он угрюмый, « односторонний », думающий все об этом и том же, этот Иван Григорьевич! ²⁶⁵

Such a comment demonstrates a remarkable insensitivity. Having spent the greater part of his life in Stalin's concentration camps, in conditions not remotely comparable to the comfort enjoyed by Lenin in exile, Ivan not unnaturally seeks answers to the nature of the system which blighted his life.

Still less convincing is the claim that Ivan's life, . . . 'проходила вдали от архивов и библиотечных спецхранов'.²⁶⁶ This is an unbelievably naive observation for a leading Soviet academic to make. To say it lacks sophistication is an understatement. No archives or libraries can provide the profound knowledge of Soviet society and its degradation under Stalin which Ivan has acquired. Ivan is a living archive. It is this immense wealth of experience, gleaned over a quarter of a century, which makes both the philosophical-historical chapters complement the narrative aspects of Vse techet. Solecisms and inconsistencies there may well be, but Grossman's arguments still carry great authority. Both aspects enrich one another, and indeed are inconceivable without one another. Vodolazov surely errs when he states that Vse techet is:

...не научный трактат, а художественное произведение. И должна восприниматься и оцениваться по законам художественности. ²⁶⁷

One suspects that few in the West or the East support this view. Works of art are not locked in the spetskhran for twenty five years unless there is a compelling reason. Were Vse techet solely a work of art without any disconcerting conclusions for Soviet ideology, it would be a superfluous exercise to repudiate Grossman. Vodolazov's

lengthy essay reflects not only Grossman's artistic achievement, but his intellectual one, and moreover the powerful and effective synthesis of the two. Moreover, it should be noted that Vse techet was first published in the Soviet Union as recently as June 1989, at a time when the campaign of glasnost' was apparently well established. Indication perhaps that even in the age of glasnost', Vse techet still worried the authorities.

The strength of Grossman's arguments can be seen in the need for a fresh approach to the Leninist tradition. Under attack the faithful are forced to reconsider the tenets of their faith, including Lenin himself. Healthy scepticism and renewed intellectual vigour characterise Vodolazov's approach to an area which has always remained inviolate:

« Заново » означает генеральную перепроверку всех прежних оценок, всех постановок вопросов, всех идей и цитат, всех выводов. Никаких аксиом, никаких « истин, не требующих доказательств », никаких принимаемых на веру положений! 268

According to Vodolazov, Stalin departs from the heritage of Marx, Engels and Lenin in three crucial areas: ordinary people were reduced to cogs in the state machinery; the Party came to see itself as a sword-bearing order of knights; and as the realisation of socialism grew closer, so the class struggle with its attendant violence would increase. 269 Marx, Engels and Lenin may well have wanted to liberate man from what they believed was economic drudgery and wage slavery in order to stimulate his nobler impulses. But in concentrating almost exclusively on the means of production, they seriously neglected other human needs. Economic and industrial considerations dominated their attitude to change. Stalin inherited these convictions and implemented them with a stunning and unprecedented brutality. As the population was mobilised, individuals lost their identity; they became canon fodder.

With breathtaking impertinence and disregard for the last 70 years of Soviet history Vodolazov expects his readership to accept that the Party is not a:

... закрытый, замкнутый средновековый « орден »
привилегированная каста, господствующая над народом и втайне
решающая все вопросы его судьбы.

On the contrary the Party is an

...открытая, демократическая организация, добровольно
взявшая на себя обязанность выполнять волю народа. 270

Not only is this a patent distortion of reality, but it ignores Lenin's well known attitude to the Party and its activists. Together with Tkachev and Nechaev, Lenin advocated the creation of a revolutionary élite. Like them, he believed in a violent revolution, and the need to use violence to implement reform after the revolution. We need look no further than Lenin's What is to be Done? (Chto delat'?; 1902) for this.

Lenin, not Stalin, broke with Marxist theory. An alliance with the peasantry, the authoritarian party, and the rejection of a two-stage revolution were all contrary to classical Marxism. Deviation from Marxist doctrine and frequent recourse to pragmatic policy decisions never bothered Lenin, or Stalin, whom Grossman equates with Nechaev:

...в его [Stalin's] аморальности выразился революционер
нечаевского типа, того, для которого любые средства
оправданы грядущей целью. Но, конечно, Нечаев бы
содрогнулся, увидев до каких чудовищных размеров довел
нечаевщину Иосиф Сталин. 271

Notions of class struggle did not originate with Stalin either. As in so many areas Stalin took and applied the ideas of others with terrifying simplicity. On these three points there are no flaws in Grossman's belief that Stalinism was a logical continuation of Leninism; that Stalin, . . . 'поднял и укрепил над Россией ленинское знамя'. 272

In seeking to isolate Marx, Engels and Lenin from the Stalin contagion, Vodolazov refers us to their writings. This is an unfortunate recommendation. Theory bewitches and seduces the intellect, as Grossman has repeatedly pointed out. When difficulties arise, it is not the failure of the theoretical assumptions that are called into question, but the human component itself. Furthermore, Marx and Engels had no practical experience of government. Lenin's was minimal. Appeals to the authority of theory indicate that despite 70 years of manifest failure, its attractions remain as strong as ever for some. Stalin did not have the intellectual acumen of his three predecessors. However, he did have a sound practical awareness of the

problems facing the Soviet Union. Confronted with capitalist hostility, Stalin felt justified in adopting the most ruthless means and indulging in the shabbiest pragmatism. In both of these pursuits Lenin was a good teacher, as Stalin showed in the thirties; even the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact had echoes of Brest-Litovsk. Thus it makes no sense to accuse Stalin (as Vodolazov does) of failing to follow the templates of classical Marxism.²⁷³ When expedient, Stalin, like Lenin, was quick to drop Engels and Marx.

Only marginally less tendentious is Vodolazov's analysis of Stalinism. Unlike Bocharov, he recognises that it is insufficient to dismiss Stalinism simply as a deformation. It is, he says, important to understand, . . . 'истоки этого движения от нормы к деформации'.²⁷⁴ This reasonable expectation obscures a massive concession. One agrees that it is important to understand the transition from the norm to the deformation. But before that can be undertaken, we need a clear idea of the norm itself, of what was allegedly perverted and debased. This we do not have. In fact Vodolazov concedes as much himself. In his preamble to the 'Essence and Roots of Stalinism' we find the following:

И так, сталинизм, что же это? Откуда это? Этот кошмар в стране той революции, которая хотела навсегда покончить с эксплуатацией, насилием, унижением человеческого достоинства, хотела быть началом мирового гуманизма и человеколюбия?²⁷⁵

These may have been the intentions. Yet they were never fulfilled. Seventy years on, the promises have still not been made good. Thus it is meaningless to talk of the deformation of Leninist norms. The norm which has done more than any other to define Soviet society is Stalinism. There is therefore an element of paradox in perestroyka: it, not Stalinism, is the deviation from the norm. Historically, despite all the talk of Lenin, perestroyka has no norms to follow. Its exponents must define them for themselves. This accounts for its erratic course, its uncertainties and dangers. For the same reason Vodolazov's cancer analogy is not entirely satisfactory. Stalin is the carcinoma - Lenin the healthy body, his rule the norm. Yet Soviet society between 1918-1924 was far from 'healthy'. Civil war, intervention, famine and War Communism left their mark. Cancer is a

reaction to an unhealthy environment. Stalinism is a symptom of a deeper underlying malaise; as Grossman argues, it is the triumph of a millennium of slavery.

In fact, as Vodolazov acknowledges, conditions for the establishment of a more humane society were far from propitious. Many of those who had taken part in the Revolution and Civil war had been brutalised. Democratic discussion was a luxury forbidden in time of crisis. Opposition was eliminated. Such norms had a serious effect on the nascent Soviet society. Violence, ruthlessness and intolerance were regarded as legitimate means of resolving disputes. This is all true, but to call this the 'социальная база « раннего сталинизма » 276 is misleading. Lawlessness is deeply rooted in Russian history. Such behaviour was encouraged by Lenin and Trotsky. More accurately, we should talk of the Leninist basis of Stalinism. But this too is unsatisfactory. During the early years anarchy and chaos reigned over large parts of Lenin's newly acquired empire. Nevertheless, we are still required to go beyond Lenin.

Vodolazov does not give any lengthy consideration to the purges of the thirties. He puts forward the view that the Terror was a conflict between two variants of Stalinism: those who had come into their own after the Civil War, and the emerging class of bureaucrats. Victory went to the latter. Vodolazov candidly admits that the 'логика' and 'объективный смысл' 277 for the purges have yet to be found and understood. Grossman's own explanation in Vse techet is intriguing. Although he had routed freedom, Stalin continued to fear it; and here is one reason why he frequently appealed to freedom, and why it served as the alleged basis for his policies. To quote Grossman:

То, что государство без свободы всегда действовало от имени свободы и демократии, боялось ступить шаг без упоминания ее имени, свидетельствовало о силе свободы. 278

Grossman agrees with Vodolazov that the popular view that everything was out of control is mistaken. Turmoil was instigated by Stalin with a specific aim in mind. As ever, Grossman's answer is provocative and disturbing. The purges were a ghastly theatrical spectacle played out to fool the ghost of freedom, an opportunity to exorcise its influence, and the individual's longing for it. However Stalin failed:

Незримый владыка продолжал жить всюду, где, казалось, безраздельно торжествовала несвобода. Его единственного до конца своих дней ужасался Сталин. 279

Grossman's explanation is unlikely to find much support among historians 280 seeking clearly identifiable causes which cohere with the view that leaders, even totalitarian ones, behave in a way that can be understood. That Stalin should set such a process in motion for such aims seems too shocking, too outrageous, to contemplate. However, the assumption that there is an 'objective meaning' is itself not entirely sound. Is this Marxist or non-Marxist objectivity? Bizarre as it is, Grossman's explanation deserves to be considered alongside the others.

Notwithstanding informed criticism and some coherent arguments from scholars of diametrically opposed political viewpoints, the strength of Grossman's case in Vse techet remains largely undiminished. Odolazov's efforts to salvage Lenin's reputation as a defender of freedom from traducement by Grossman, and to dissociate the supposed humanity of Leninism from the barbarism of Stalinism, fail. Nor does Stolypin succeed in convincing us that Grossman's vision of Russia's history is factually unsound, or flawed in explication, or detrimental to Russia's interests.

Grossman's achievement in Vse techet has already been partly accounted for. The success of the work lies in the effective combination of the narrative and philosophical-historical passages. There was a conscious effort on Grossman's part to combine the two. The suggestion that the work is thus structured because of undue haste on Grossman's part is implausible. 281 Ivan Grigorevich, Anna Sergeevna, Masha and Lev Mekler impart compelling substance to the discussion of Leninism and Stalinism. They are the flesh and blood, the human material, a small sample of the cost. Without them the impact of the expansive philosophical-historical passages would be greatly impoverished.

Then perhaps there is the question of Grossman's own death, which by the time Grossman began to write the second version of Vse techet, was only months away. Impending death heightened Grossman's consciousness, perception and intuition; it liberated him. Behind the decade of progress and change, Grossman identified the continuity of

Russian slavery in the aftermath of the Revolution. More clearly than most he saw that 'Utopianism is never far from gangsterism'.²⁸² The breadth and depth of his thinking are striking, even if, in essence, his ideas are not new. From the philosophy of the sceptical, dying Shatovskoy to the author of Vse techet there is an unerring and demonstrable line.

Grossman's language enhances the power of his message. His style in Vse techet is direct and lucid, at times Spartan. Arguments are presented with the clarity of mathematical propositions. The logic is relentless. But Grossman's art is more complex, more ingenious. Grossman appeals simultaneously to our moral being, intellect and intuition. We know, we think, we feel that we are in the presence of a great, unassailable and ineffable truth. We are moved by its sorrow, by the boundless and terrible suffering it records, but there is something inspirational, morally edifying in its austere beauty, in the stark, uncompromising nature of its tragedy. The effect is not unlike that found in the Gospels or Revelations. Yet the effect is no artistic device, no prestidigitator's illusion. In its intellectual, moral and artistic conception Vse techet represents the total embodiment of Grossman's belief that: 'Абсолютная истина прекраснее всего'.²⁸³ Both as artist and man Grossman delivers himself of his life's work. In so doing he has reached levels of artistic attainment and integrity which only a handful of his contemporaries have matched. Paradoxically, Vse techet itself provides the sternest challenge to Grossman's ideas on the nature of the Russian national psyche. Vse techet is utterly divorced from the debilitating dogmas of Soviet society (or any other). Only a man who was intellectually, spiritually and morally free could have risen to such heights. Vse techet was born in chains, but it was written in freedom.

Concluding Remarks

As recently as 1986 Shimon Markish wrote that, . . . ' there is nothing in the pre-war Grossman that prefigures the future author of Life and Fate '.¹ Repudiation of this assessment has been central to this study. Pre-war works such as "Los'", "Molodaya i staraya", "Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dnei", Stepan Kol'chugin and "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam" are of major importance for our understanding of the genesis and evolution of Grossman's heresy.

Epic novel and drama form Grossman's first serious attempts to address the themes of war and progress. With varying degrees of success both works challenge Soviet assumptions. Many questions of profound importance are first raised in Stepan Kol'chugin. What is the purpose of scientific research? To whom or what does the scientist owe ultimate loyalty? Very little separates the scientific ethos of Davydovich, Chepyzhin or Shtrum. With regard to war, Grossman holds out little possibility that it will be eradicated, or that its attractions will diminish. This remains his most cogent rebuttal of the notion of conflict-free Utopia.

Artistically, "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam" is not a complete success. The play's central idea does not lend itself to translation onto the stage, at least not in the form presented by Grossman. It is poorly served by the genre. Incorporated into a much larger work, part of a greater, more chronologically complex narrative, or possibly the theme of an essay, it would, one feels, have been more successful. Intellectually, however, it is coherent, and it is this which Soviet critics both feared and resented in 1946.

Alluded to in "Esli verit' pifagoreytsam" and Stepan Kol'chugin, the consequences of totalitarianism are explicit in those povesti first published in the sixties. Mass arrests, denunciations, isolation and the calculated undermining of the nuclear family are not the themes of a contented writer in a society at peace with itself. "Los'", "Molodaya i staraya", and "Neskol'ko pechal'nykh" are fine pieces of writing in their own right, but they are very much part of a greater whole.

To be sure, the epic grandeur, scope and profundity of Zhizn' i sud'ba would have been inconceivable without the titanic struggle

witnessed by Grossman on the Eastern front. But the seed of heresy had already begun to germinate before 1941, undergoing its spectacular, moving, and at times, painful and dangerous metamorphosis during and after the war. Two events in the war are crucial.

The Battle of Stalingrad was the great spiritual turning point in Grossman's life. The military explanations for the demise of Von Paulus's 6th Army seem somehow inadequate. Concentration of resources at the enemy's weak points, aggressive exploitation and rapid encirclement are doubtless the generally preferred explanations for the victory. Yet there was something else at the back of the Russians' victory. Something akin to a miracle took place in the rubble, streets, factories and trenches of Stalingrad in the autumn of 1942. Grossman witnessed that miracle. In turn he was transformed by it.

Grossman lost his mother in the Holocaust. He also lost his innocence. Soviet internationalism could not be reconciled with the evidence of widespread participation and collaboration on the part of Soviet citizens in the murder of Jews. The refined barbarity of the death camps was a German invention. But it was not without its Soviet admirers. State institutionalised anti-Semitism, the persecution of prominent Jewish intellectuals after the war and the proscription of the all important Chernaya kniga, confirmed Grossman's worst fears.

In assessing an author's achievement, certain pitfalls must be acknowledged. To concentrate one's mental resources for any length of time on a single author is inevitably to run the risk of becoming too attached, too biased. One tends to inflate his importance, to ignore the merits of his fellows, to become less willing to see the author's flaws. Notwithstanding these risks, an evaluation of Grossman's place in the pantheon of Russian writers must be undertaken.

Spanning twenty years, Grossman's achievement in the field of war literature is unique. The Stalingrad sketches alone would be sufficient to ensure his reputation. The breadth and diversity which are such prominent features of Za pravoe delo and Zhizn' i sud'ba, are clearly evident in Grossman's wartime writing. With regard to Vasilii Grossman George Steiner's remark that: 'Heresy refuses exegetic finality'², strikes one as profoundly apposite. "Tvorchestvo pobedy", "Treblinskiy ad", "Na rubezhe voyny i mira" and his editorial work for

the Chernaya kniga all bear witness to a restless mind; one that could not be constrained within narrow ideological parameters. In the opinion of this author such works by Grossman - not to mention those of non-fiction and fiction by other authors - suggest that Soviet war literature and historiography are more complex and heterogeneous than, for example, Geoffrey Hosking asserts.³

Equally, Za pravoe delo and its author must be excluded from Max Hayward's assessment of Soviet literature in the years preceding Stalin's death:

...the succeeding years until 1953 saw the development of a literature which offers no insight into the real thoughts or feelings of those writers who still published. There was no way of telling a true conformist from a false conformist, and only after Stalin's death was it possible to discern faces behind the masks.⁴

Don Piper is much closer to the truth when he writes that: 'Grossman's For a Righteous Cause was a remarkable anomaly in 1952'.⁵

Zhizn' i sud'ba is an outstanding artistic and intellectual synthesis. Countless and varied threads combine the lives of Grossman's characters; any suggestion that the work sprawls or is shapeless is unsustainable. Above all, so many lives are bound together by the fate of Stalingrad. Only towards the end of the novel does the power of its gravity begin to recede. Thoughts on the nature of military strategy, the psychology of killing, the perennial conflict between commissars and soldiers convincingly and unobtrusively coexist with the discourse on human freedom, goodness and totalitarian ideology. Zhizn' i sud'ba is indeed the 'main book' on the Great Fatherland War. But it is, also, too one of the main books of Soviet literature. Future critics and literary historians will, one feels, unhesitatingly place Zhizn' i sud'ba and Vse techet alongside the achievements of Bulgakov, Pasternak and Solzhenitsyn.

Russia's spirit resides in her literature; it is her solace, her great treasure, which surpasses all else she has. Throughout the darker and turbulent periods of their history, Russians have always sought spiritual and moral guidance from their writers. Zhizn' i sud'ba and Vse techet continue this honourable tradition. They are an indispensable weapon in the battle to confront and eradicate the

legacy of the Stalinist past, and thus its grip on the present. Zhizn' i sud'ba and Vse techet represent an acute and sustained challenge to the hegemony of Marxism-Leninism and to the idea that the CPSU should enjoy a guiding and leading role in Soviet society. That these works have been published in the Soviet Union, bodes well for intellectual freedom in that troubled state. The remarkable and inspiring events which took place in Eastern Europe in 1989, and which continue to gain an unstoppable momentum are a direct consequence of Grossman's belief - stunningly vindicated - that: 'Человек добровольно не откажется от свободы. В этом выводе свет нашего времени.' 6

Endnotes

Chapter I: The Life and Fate of Vasilii Grossman

1. Reviewing Vse techet, Gleb Struve commented that: 'A few stories published after 1954 are of little significance'. See Slavic Review, 31, 4, 1972, p. 943. Max Hayward's survey refers to Narod bessmertn but has nothing to say about Grossman's ordeals in 1946 and 1952-53. See Writers in Russia: 1917-1978, ed., Patricia Blake, Harvill Press, London, 1983. As late as 1988 the Moscow correspondent of The Times, Mary Dejevsky, described Grossman as an 'émigré writer'. See 'Glasnost' for the Traveller' in The Times, 29.12.1988, p. 7.
2. Shimon Markish, 'A Russian Writer's Jewish Fate', in Commentary, 4, 1986, p. 40.
3. A. G. Bocharov, Vasilii Grossman, Kritiko-biograficheskiy ocherk, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1970, p. 5.
4. F. Levin, 'Vasilii Grossman. Vstupitel'naya stat'ya', in Povesti, Rasskazy, Ocherki, Voenizdat, M., 1958, p. 4.
5. Vasilii Grossman, 'Fosfor', in Znamya, 4, 1987, p. 138.
6. Bocharov, op. cit., p. 7.
7. Grossman's story was welcomed by Babel: 'Новыми глазами увидена наша жидовская столица'. Quoted by Semen Lipkin in Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, Ardis Publishers, Ann Arbor, 1986, p. 10.
8. Literaturnaya gazeta, 02.03.1988, p. 2.
9. Bocharov, op. cit., p. 10.
10. K. Lavrova, 'O real'nom schast'ii geroev V. Grossmana', in Krasnaya nov', 4, 1941, p. 210.
11. Lipkin, op. cit., p. 16.
12. Ibid., p. 8.
13. Ibid., p. 9.
14. Ibid., p. 9.
15. Chernaya kniga, eds, Vasilii Grossman and Il'ya Ehrenburg, Tarbut Publishers, Jerusalem, 1980.
16. Lipkin, op. cit., p. 34.
17. Ibid., p. 31.

18. Ibid., p. 31.
19. Ibid., p. 31.
20. Markish quotes Svirskiy as the source in Vasiliy Grossman.
Na evreyskie temy, Vol 2., Biblioteka-Aliya, Israel, 1985, p. 512.
21. Lipkin, op. cit., p. 32.
22. The article to which Lipkin refers is 'O romane V. Grossmana
Za pravoe delo', in Pravda, 13.02.1953, pp. 3-4.
23. Lipkin, op. cit., p. 36. Grossman's very real fear of arrest is
portrayed in the little known story "Za gorodom" (1953). Alone
in a remote house, he fears every noise in the night. Grossman
mentions that he was there at the end of February. Lipkin
records that Grossman and he were in Il'inskiy, in the country,
at the time of Stalin's death (05.03.1953). Op. cit., p. 44.
24. Ibid., p. 41.
25. Znamya, 4, 1987, p. 146.
26. Lipkin, op. cit., p. 44.
27. F. Levin, op. cit., p. 6.
28. Markish, Commentary, p. 43.
29. Lipkin, op. cit., p. 55.
30. Markish, Na evreyskie temy, Vol II, p. 516.
31. Nataliya Roskina, Chetyre glavy iz literaturnykh vospominaniy,
YMCA Press, Paris, 1980, p. 114.
32. L. Anninskiy, 'Mirozdan'e Vasiliya Grossmana', in Druzhba narodov,
10, 1988, p. 253.
33. Lipkin, op. cit., p. 75.
34. 'Tirgarten' (1953-1955) was first published in Nash sovremennik,
7, 1966.
35. Lipkin, op. cit., p. 69.
36. Ibid., p. 78.
37. Boris Yampol'skiy, 'Poslednyaya vstrecha s Vasiliem Grossmanom',
in Kontinent, 8, 1976, p. 147.
38. Vladimir Voynovich, 'Zhizn' i sud'ba Vasiliya Grossmana i ego
romana', in Posev, 11, 1984, p. 53.
39. Igor' Zolotusskiy, 'Voyna i svoboda', in Literaturnaya gazeta,
08.06.1988, p. 4.
40. Lipkin, op. cit., p. 81.
41. Ibid., p. 81

42. Ibid., p. 82.
43. Ibid., p. 83.
44. Ibid., p. 47.
45. Ibid., p. 83.
46. Ibid., p. 83.
47. Ibid., ... запись беседы с серым кардиналом. p. 85.
48. Paul Johnson, A History of the Jews, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1987, p. 558.
49. Voynovich, op. cit., p. 54.
50. Roskina, op. cit., p. 118.
51. Quoted by Leopold Labedz, in Solzhenitsyn: a Documentary Record, Penguin, 1974, p. 125.
52. See Kontinent, Nos 4-5, 1975 & Nos 6-7, 1976.
53. Simeon Lipkin, 'Rukopisi ne goryat. Kak byl spasen roman Vasiliya Grossmana « Zhizn' i sud'ba » ', in Russkaya Mysl', 05.05.1989, pp. 8-9.
54. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, . . . об армянской поэме p. 116.
55. Ibid., p. 118.
56. Roskina, op. cit., p. 123.
57. Lipkin, op. cit., p. 139.
58. Two collections of stories were published in the sixties. Staryy uchitel', 1962, and Dobro vam!, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1967.

The latter collection is the most important, since it brings together the pre-war works "Los'", "Molodaya i staraya" and "Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dney". That Grossman was not totally disgraced may be seen from the fact that Za pravoe delo was reprinted in 1964 by Sovetskiy pisatel'. Similarly, extracts from Grossman's wartime notebooks were published in 1966. See Vasiliy Grossman, 'Iz zapisnykh knizhek voennykh let 1941-1942', in Literaturnoe nasledstvo, Sovetskie pisateli na frontakh Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny, Kniga II, t 78, M., 1966, pp. 158-179.
59. Vasiliy Grossman, 'V bol'shom kol'tse' and 'Fosfor', in Znamya, 4, 1987, pp. 127-147.
60. 'Lish' tot dostoin zhizni i svobody. Chitatel'skaya

- konferentsiya', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 24.08.1988, p.5.
- Further extracts from Grossman's wartime notebooks were also published. See 'Vasilii Grossman. Iz zapisnykh knizhek', in Voprosy literatury, 6, 1987, pp.157-177.
61. E. Taratuta, 'Chestnaya zhizn' i tyazhkaya sud'ba, vospominanie o V. Grossmane', in Ogonyok, No 40, 1987, pp.19-23.
62. Literaturnaya gazeta, No 48, 25.11.1987.
63. On 25.01.1988 I had the opportunity to speak with Sergey Zalygin. He informed me that he had been offered the manuscript of Zhizn' i sud'ba for publication in Novyy mir.
64. Efim Etkind, 'Zhizn' i sud'ba knigi', in Vremya i my, 101, 1988, p.198. Consider the following: 'Но невозможно представить себе советское общество (в любой его "вариации"), где будут без купюр изданы "Все течет" и "Жизнь и судьба". See Yuriy Kublanovskiy, 'Zhizn' i sud'ba Vasiliya Grossmana', in Grani, No 141, 1986, p.284.
65. Vasilii Grossman, "Dobro vam!", in Znamya, 11, 1988, pp.5-62.
66. Vasilii Grossman, 'Rasskazy i esse', in Znamya, 5, 1989, pp.7-30
67. Gabriele Leech-Ansprach, 'Stalingrad in russischer Sicht', in Die Welt am Sonntag, 06.10.1985. Photocopy. Page number obscured.
68. Eberhard Reißner, 'Bleibt uns die Hoffnung auf Menschlichkeit?' A paper broadcast under the auspices of Sender Freies Berlin, p.1.
69. Ilma Rakusa, 'Freiwillig verzichtet der Mensch nicht auf Freiheit', in Neue Züricher Zeitung, 03.05.1985. Photocopy. Page number obscured.
70. Andrew Nagorskiy, 'Totalitarian Horrors', in Newsweek, 23.12.1985
71. Markish, Na evreyskie temy, Vol II, p.376.
72. Vasilii Grossman, Zhizn' i sud'ba, L'âge d'Homme, Lausanne, Switzerland, 1980, p.463.
73. Ibid., p.463.
74. Vasilii Grossman, Vse techet, Possev-Verlag, Frankfurt/Main, 2nd ed, 1974, p.59.
75. Voynovich, op. cit., p.53.
76. Introduction to the Swiss publication of Zhizn' i sud'ba, iii. It should be noted that Efim Etkind is not the author of this

assessment, a point he kindly confirmed in private correspondence with me.

77. M. J. Taylor, The Life and Works of Vasiliiy S. Grossman. From 1934-1941. MA thesis Manchester University, April, 1984, Introduction, no page numbers.
78. Robert Chandler, in 'Translator's Introduction', Life and Fate, Fontana Paperbacks, 1986, p. 9.
79. Markish, Commentary, p. 43.
80. Markish, Na evreyskie temy, Vol II, государственной идеологией, p. 475.
81. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p. 29.
82. Ibid., p. 31.
83. Ibid., p. 27.
84. Ibid., p. 54.
85. L. Anninskiy, op. cit., p. 255.
86. A. Bocharov, 'Sud'ba narodnaya', in Oktyabr', 3, 1988, p. 150.
87. Oktyabr', 9, 1988, pp. 205-207.
88. 'Rukoy avtora', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 14.12.1988, p. 3.
89. Ibid., p. 3.

Chapter II: The Changing Ethos of Soviet War Literature.

1. Two recent and excellent surveys of Soviet war literature are Don Piper's chapter on the Soviet Union, in The Second World War in Fiction, ed. Holger Klein with John Flower and Eric Homberger, Macmillan, London, 1984, pp. 131-172 and Arnold McMillin's 'The Second World War in Official and Unofficial Prose', in The Second World War in Literature, ed. Ian Higgins, Scottish Academic Press, Edinburgh & London, 1987, pp. 19-31. Numerous German surveys have been published. The following are particularly useful. Erich Pruck, 'Russische Kriegsdichtung in der Sowjetliteratur. Versuch eines Uberblicks, in Wehrkunde, 7, 1958, pp. 148-153. Pruck describes Grossman's Za pravoe delo as a 'psychological' novel, op. cit., p. 151. Nyota Thun, Krieg und Literatur. Studien zur sowjetischen Prosa von 1941 bis zur Gegenwart, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1977. There are dozens of Soviet studies and a more comprehensive list

will be given in the bibliography of secondary sources.

2. Alexander Werth, Russia at War, 1941-1945, Barrie and Rockcliff London, 1964, p. 768.
3. L. Plotkin, Literatura i voyna. Velikaya Otechestvennaya Voyna v russkoy sovetskoy proze, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1967, p.297.
4. Aleksey Surkov, Sobranie sochineniy, t. 1, M., 1965, p.387.
5. See I. V. Stalin, Works, Vol.2, 1941-1945, ed. Robert H. McNeal, The Hoover Institute on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, 1967, p.203. Another useful collection of Stalin's wartime speeches can be found in J. Stalin. On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union, FLPH, M., 1944.
6. Ideologically orthodox definitions of Fascism, chauvinism, patriotism and nationalism can be found in the third edition of the Velikaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya. The definition of nationalism (Vol.17, p.358.) embodies many aspects of Stalin's Russia. Note the following: 'Важнейшим принципом коммунистического воспитания является принцип единства советского патриотизма и социалистического интернационализма', in Voenno-patrioticheskoe vospitanie uchashchikhsya na zanyatiyakh po nachal'noy voennoy podgotovke, A. M. Katuchkov & E. H Tsetaev, Prosveshchenie, M., 1984, p.8.
7. Ol'ga Berggol'ts, Izbrannye proizvedeniya v dvukh tomakh, vol.1, Khudozhestvennaya literatura, L., 1967, p.2.
8. Vera Inber, Sobranie sochineniy, vol.1, Khudozhestvennaya literatura, M., 1965, p.9.
9. Berggol'ts, op. cit., p.166.
10. 03.07.1941.
11. John A. Armstrong, Soviet Partisans in World War Two, University of Wisconsin Press, 1964, p.49.
12. Alexander Fadeev, Za tridsat' let, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1957, p.179.
13. Konstantin Simonov, Sobranie sochineniy, vol. 4, Khudozhestvennaya literatura, M., 1967, p.71.
14. For a full account of this see V. Petrov, June 22. 1941: Soviet Historians and the German Invasion, University of South Carolina Press, 1968.
15. See P. E. Glinkin, 'Epos narodnogo podviga', in Russkaya

- literatura, 1, 1971, p.31. A. Bocharov is critical of this change in emphasis. See Chelovek i voyna. Idei sotsialisticheskogo gumanizma v poslevoennoy proze o voyne, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1973. Similarly, Plotkin is unsympathetic towards those writers who wish to probe too deeply. He asks: 'Какие могли быть здесь поиски правды?' Op. cit., p.130
16. Interview with Vasil' Bykov, in Literaturnaya gazeta, 18.01.1989, p.4.
17. Na zapadnom fronte bez peremen, perevod S. Myatezhnogo i N. Cherevina, M., 1929, and Na zapadnom fronte bez peremen, perevod pod red. D. Ulanskogo, Izdatel'stvo Zif, M., 1929.
18. Karl-Dieter van Ackern, Bulat Okudžava und die kritische Literatur über den Krieg, Otto Sagner, Munich, 1976, p.65. Van Ackern's assessment of Remarquism comes close to the sentiments expressed by Wilfred Owen: 'Somit erschließt sich Remarquismus in seinem gedanklichen Kern als ein Synonym für Gefährdung der patriotischen Erziehung der Jugend', p.65. Thun rejects any comparison with Remarque: 'Die Vergleiche mit Remarque waren jedoch nicht aufrechtzuerhalten, da etwas miteinander nicht Vergleichbares aneinander gemessen wurde'. Op. cit., p.177.
19. T. Motyleva, 'Remark i sovetskie chitateli', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 01.03.1960. British Library Microfilm. Page number obscured. On the origins of Remarquism she writes: 'Вульгарно-социологическая критика начала 30-х годов породила штампованное выражение « ремаркизм », обозначающее изображение ужасов войны без всякого их осмысления'. The following disclaimer is indicative of just how problematic Remarque is for Soviet critics: 'Интерес массового советского читателя к романам Ремарка вовсе не есть показатель каких-то нездоровых настроений'. (My emphasis).
20. See 'Vospevat' geroicheskoe', in Krasnaya zvezda, 09.02.1964, p.2. The article referred to is the text of Marshal Malinovskiy's and General Epishev's addresses to the Union of Writers. Curiously, none of the Remarquist writers were named.
21. Malinovskiy, op. cit.
22. Malinovskiy, op. cit.
23. Filosofskoe nasledie V. I. Lenina i problemy sovremennoy voyny,

- Voenizdat, M., 1972. Quotations are taken from the English translation, The Philosophical Heritage of V. I. Lenin and Problems of Contemporary War, USAAF, vol.5, in the series Soviet Military Thought. Consider the following: 'Entry by the Soviet Union into the war constituted the decisive factor in transforming it into a just, anti-fascist war' (p.275.)
24. A lucid account of just and unjust wars within the context of Marxist-Leninist doctrine can be found in P. H. Vigor's study, The Soviet View of War, Peace and Neutrality, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London and Boston, 1975.
 25. P. N. Pospelov i dr., Istoriya Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny Sovetskogo Soyuza 1941-1945 v shesti tomakh, Voennoe izdatel'stvo ministerstva oborony, M., 1965, vol.1, p.9.
 26. Filosofskoe nasledie Lenina, p.72.
 27. Heinz Lemmermann's Kriegserziehung im Kaiserreich. Studien zur politischen Funktion von Schule und Schulmusik 1890-1918, Bremen, 1984 is a detailed study of this phenomenon.
 28. Gerhard Nebel, Ernst Jünger, Abenteuer des Geistes, Mareesverlag, Wuppertal, 1949, p.52. See too Graf von Krackow, Die Entscheidung: Eine Untersuchung über Ernst Jünger, Carl Schmidt, Martin Heidegger, Ferdinand Enke Verlag, Stuttgart, 1958, p.30. Commenting on this period, John Nef writes: 'The common man was offered, on an unprecedented scale, the opportunity to participate in what seemed a compelling purpose, at a time when all sense of purpose in peace and ordinary living was being lost', in War and Human Progress, Norton Library, N.Y., 1968, p.409.
 29. Ernst Jünger, 'Der Kampf als inneres Erlebnis', Gesammelte Werke, Band VII, Klett-Cotta, Stuttgart, 1979, p.38.
 30. 'V gostyakh u Remarka', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 01.11.1962. Remarque observed: 'Наука преодолела все. Только людям не удалось стать друг другу ближе. Где мы собственно говоря оказались? Во многом мы не сделали ни шага. В середине XX века у нас были концентрационные лагеря и газовые камеры. Мы не можем оглянуться на наше прошлое, оно еще здесь'. British Library Microfilm. Page number obscured.
 31. Erich Maria Remarque, Im Westen nichts Neues, Verlag Kiepenheuer

- & Witsch, 1984, p.159. All quotations taken from this edition.
32. Ibid., p.236.
 33. Ibid., p.176.
 34. Ibid., p.176.
 35. Ibid., p.55.
 36. Ibid., p.207.
 37. Ilya Fradkin, 'Remark i spory o nem', in Voprosy literatury, 1, 1963, p.118.
 38. P. Toper, 'Chelovek na voyne', in Voprosy literatury, 4, 1961, p.48.
 39. Motyleva, op. cit.
 40. L. Kopelev, 'Pobedy i porazheniya Remarka', in Yunost', 3, 1960, p.67. According to Kopelev the Russian translations were very popular. Among those translated are: Arc de Triomphe (Triumfal'naya arka; 1959), Zeit zu leben. Zeit zu sterben (Vremya zhit' i vremya umirat'; 1959), Der Weg zurÜck (Vozvrashchenie; 1959), Der schwarze Obelisk (Chernyy obelisk; 1961) and Drei Kameraden (Tri Tovarishcha; 1959).
 41. Toper, op. cit., p.48.
 42. Arnold McMillin, op. cit., p.27.
 43. Letter to the author, 20.02.1987.
 44. Viktor Nekrasov, 'Cherez sorok let', in Stalingrad, Possev-Verlag, Frankfurt/Main, 1981, p.439.
 45. Viktor Nekrasov, Izbrannye proizvedeniya, M., 1962, p.13.
 46. Ibid., p.16.
 47. N. Mikhaylovskiy's recollection of Malinovskiy in the retreat of 1942 is very much at odds with the glamorous image of war that Malinovskiy demands from writers. See 'Malen'kie rasskazy o bol'shoy voyne', in Zvezda, 5, 1988, p.91.
 48. Nekrasov, Izbrannye proizvedeniya, p.20.
 49. Ibid., p.50.
 50. See, for example, P. Toper, Radi zhizni na zemle, Sovetskiiy pisatel', M., 1971, and Plotkin, op. cit.
 51. Nekrasov, Izbrannye proizvedeniya, p.91.
 52. Bulat Okudzhava, Bud' zdorov, shkolyar, Possev-Verlag,

- Frankfurt/Main, 1964, p. 1.
53. Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, 3rd edn., M., vol. 6, pp. 422-23. Equally informative are Katuchkov and Tsetaev, op. cit., p. 23. See too Filosofskoe nasledie Lenina. On heroism it notes the following: 'It is not the exceptional or unusual nature of a deed but rather its total conformity with the main ideals of our era, with the ideals of communism which defines the heroic.', p. 199.
54. Okudzhava, op. cit., p. 1.
55. Ibid., p. 12.
56. L. Kryachko, 'Geroy ne khochet vzroslet'', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 19.03.1963. British Library Microfilm. Page number obscured.
57. Okudzhava, op. cit., p. 52.
58. Malinovskiy, op. cit.
59. Grigory Baklanov, 'Mertvye sramu ne imut', in Pyad' zemli. Povesti, Rasskazy, Izvestiya, M., 1978, p. 318.
60. Ibid., p. 91.
61. Ibid., p. 94.
62. Toper, Radi zhizni na zemle, p. 395.
63. Baklanov, op. cit., p. 351.
64. Ibid., p. 99.
65. Ibid., p. 111.
66. Grigory Baklanov, 'Nauka i religiya', in Den' nyneshniy i den' minuvshiy, Moskovskiy rabochiy, M., 1977, p. 261.
67. See Voprosy literatury, 5, 1985, p. 11.
68. Arnold McMillin has written that, . . . 'Bykaŭ's unwillingness to pull punches in the description of the negative manifestations of human nature - demagoguery, cowardice, treachery, and cruelty, for example - gives his stories particular relevance today.' See 'War and Peace in the Prose of Vasil Bykaŭ', in Die Welt der Slaven, 1, 1983, p. 111.
69. Voprosy literatury, 5, 1985, p. 32.
70. See Voprosy istorii, 6, 1988. Grossman was referred to once. Yu. A. Lukin of the Academy of Social Sciences said of Zhizn' i sud'ba, that it was, . . . 'высокая правда о времени, о Сталине' op. cit., p. 99.

71. Ibid., p. 4.
72. Ibid., p. 4.
73. Ibid., p. 4.
74. Ibid., p. 5.
75. V. Shaposhnikov, 'Tsena pobedy', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 22.06.1988, p. 4.
76. Tat'yana Vasil'eva, 'Slezy nevoli', in Zvezda, 5, 1988, pp. 32-76.
77. Il'ya Palkin, 'Neizvestnye soldaty', in Zvezda, 5, 1988, pp. 167-179.
78. Anatoliy Genatulin, 'Tunnel'', in Znamya, 12, 1987, pp. 3-80.
79. Editorial, 'Pomnit' uroki istorii', in Voenno-istoricheskiy zhurnal, 6, 1988, p. 3.
80. Ibid., p. 3. Compare this with Stalin's: 'Вероломное военное нападение гитлеровской Германии . . .'. Op. cit., p. 1.
81. Ibid., p. 3.
82. Lt-General M. Gareev, 'Velikiy Oktyabr' i zashchita Otechestva', in Oktyabr, 2, 1988, p. 183. Gareev's article reflects the real fears and anxieties on the part of the military. Their ability to control literature and discussions of military history is greatly reduced compared to what it was in the sixties and seventies.
83. Ibid., p. 183.
84. Mikhail Kozhukov, interview, 'Soviet reporter changed by hell of Afghan war', in The Times, 14.01.1989, p. 8.
85. See 'Afgantsy', in Znamya, 7, 1988, pp. 185-219.
86. Ibid. There are numerous references to Western pop groups.

Chapter III: The War Years

1. Vasiliiy Grossman, Stepan Kol'chugin, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1951, p. 512.
2. Ibid., p. 521.
3. Ibid., p. 618.
4. Lavrova, op. cit., p. 207.
5. Ibid., p. 207.
6. Stepan Kol'chugin, p. 571.
7. Ibid., p. 506.
8. Vasiliiy Grossman, Gody voyny, Ogiz, M., 1946, p. 18. This

volume contains the bulk of Grossman's wartime povesti and ocherki.

9. Ibid., p. 20.
10. Ibid., p. 19.
11. Ibid., p. 94.
12. Ibid., p. 108.
13. Ibid., p. 79.
14. V. Pertsov, Podvig i Geroy. Etyudy o sovetskoy literature, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1946, p. 37.
15. Gody voyny, p. 123.
16. Ibid., p. 51.
17. Ibid., p. 57.
18. A. Lavretskiy, 'Sotsialisticheskiy chelovek v Otechestvennoy Voyne', in Znamya, 1, 1943, p. 270.
19. Roskina, op. cit., p. 108.
20. 'The Man who fights in the Red Army', in The Times, 22.02.1943, p. 5. Unattributed.
21. Quoted by Bocharov in Vasiliy Grossman, p. 15.
22. D. Ortenberg, 'Pisateli na voyne', in Zvezda, 3, 1975, p. 149.
23. Alexander Werth, The Year of Stalingrad, Hamish Hamilton, London, 1946, p. 277.
24. Quoted by Markish in Na evreyskie temy, Vol. II., p. 497.
25. Ortenberg, op. cit., p. 149.
26. Viktor Nekrasov, V zhizni i pismakh, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1971, p. 150.
27. M. Kuznetsov, 'Shkola muzhestva', in Literatura i iskusstvo, 14.08.1943. British Library Microfilm. Page number obscured.
28. Gody voyny, p. 224.
29. Ibid., p. 228.
30. Ibid., p. 230.
31. Ibid., p. 231.
32. Ortenberg, op. cit., p. 151. Original title was "Pervaya vstrecha". In all probability this was a working title.
33. Gody voyny, p. 187.
34. Ibid., p. 187.
35. Ibid., p. 186.
36. Ibid., p. 190.

37. Ibid., p. 191.
38. Yampol'skiy, op. cit., p. 134.
39. Quoted by Ortenberg, op. cit., p. 150.
40. Ibid., p. 151. Originally called "Na stalingradskoy pereprave".
41. Gody voyny, p. 206.
42. M. P. Gallagher, The Soviet History of World War II. Myths, Memories and Realities, Frederick A. Praeger, N. Y. & London, 1963, p. 105.
43. Gody voyny, p. 208.
44. Ibid., p. 210.
45. Ibid., p. 211.
46. Ortenberg, op. cit., p. 151.
47. Bocharov, Vasiliy Grossman, p. 168.
48. Ibid., p. 167.
49. Gody voyny, p. 210.
50. Ibid., p. 211.
51. Ibid., p. 279.
52. Bocharov, Vasiliy Grossman, p. 166.
53. Werth, The Year of Stalingrad, p. 232.
54. Gody voyny, p. 195.
55. Zhizn' i sud'ba, L'Age d'Homme, p. 65.
56. Gody voyny, p. 203.
57. Ibid., p. 203.
58. A Soviet acquaintance of Werth had the following to say on the standard of reporting: 'On the whole I admit it's very bad. Eugene Petrov was good; and Polyakov was good, but now they are both dead. Krieger and Grossman are good at times. But nearly all the rest are bad.' See The Year of Stalingrad, p. 332. He went on to say that the reasons for these shortcomings were due to the fact that Soviet reporters had not learned to follow Stalin's advice. (!)
59. Gody voyny, p. 198.
60. Ibid., p. 198.
61. Ibid., p. 199.
62. Ibid., p. 199.
63. Ibid., p. 181.
64. Ibid., p. 183.

65. Ibid., p. 270.
66. 'Lish' tot dostoin zhizni i svobody', chitatel'skaya konferentsiya Literaturnaya gazeta, 24.08.1988., p. 5.
67. Literaturnoe nasledstvo, vol. 78., p. 173.
68. Ibid., p. 173.
69. Quoted by Philip Knightley, in The First Casualty, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, N.Y. & London, 1975, p. 259.
70. Gody voyny, p. 234.
71. Ibid., p. 237.
72. Ibid., p. 243.
73. Werth, The Year of Stalingrad, p. 277.
74. Ibid., p. 277.
75. Ibid., p. 281.
76. Quoted by Bocharov in Vasiliy Grossman, p. 162.
77. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p. 16.
78. Gody voyny, p. 259.
79. Ibid., p. 271.
80. Ibid., p. 277.
81. Ibid., p. 268.
82. Ibid., p. 267.
83. Ibid., p. 268.
84. A. Derman, 'Podvig pisatelya', in Znamya, 8, 1946, p. 213.
85. Bocharov, Vasiliy Grossman, p. 160.
86. Werth, The Year of Stalingrad, p. 332.
87. Derman, op. cit., p. 211.
88. Ibid., p. 211.
89. Ibid., p. 212.
90. Kuznetsov, op. cit.
91. R. F. Christian, Tolstoy. A Critical Introduction, CUP, 1969, p. 58.
92. Grossman, Literaturnoe nasledstvo, p. 168.
93. L. N. Tolstoy, Sobranie sochineniy, vol. 2., M., 1960, p. 156.
94. Knightley, op. cit., p. 258.
95. Christian, op. cit., p. 58.
96. D. Mercer et al, The Fog of War, Heinemann, London., 1987, p. 109.
97. L. N. Tolstoy, Sobranie sochineniy, vol. 4., p. 239.
98. Gody voyny, p. 348.

99. Markish, Na evreyskie temy, vol. II., p.337. Markish's study contains the full Russian version.
100. Chernaya kniga, p.32.
101. Primo Levi suggests that the Nazis' fanatical hatred of the Jews cannot be understood. He writes, . . .
"understanding" a proposal or human behaviour means to "contain" it, contain its author, put oneself in his place, identify with him. Now, no normal human being will ever be able to identify with Hitler, Himmler, Goebbels, Eichmann, and endless others'. He continues: 'War is always a terrible fact, to be deprecated, but it is in us, it has its rationality, we "understand". But there is no rationality in the Nazi hatred: it is a hate that is not in us; it is outside man, it is a poison fruit sprung from the deadly trunk of Fascism, but it is outside and beyond Fascism itself'. See If This is a Man & The Truce, trans., Stuart Woolf, Abacus, London., 1987, pp.395-396.
102. Gody voyny, p.410.
103. Ibid., p.416.
104. Ibid., p.418.
105. Ibid., p.428.
106. Ibid., p.415.
107. Hannah Arendt, Eichmann in Jerusalem, Faber & Faber, London, 1963, p.231.
108. Gody voyny, p.438., . . .рассказать страшную правду.
109. Ibid., p.438.
110. See, for example, the discussion of the Great Fatherland War in Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, vol .4., p.387.
111. Vasiliiy Grossman, 'Na rubezhe voyny i mira', in Povesti, Rasskazy, Ocherki, Voenizdat, M., 1958, p.532.
112. 'Iz frontovykh zapisnykh knizhek V. Grossmana', in Voprosy literatury, 6, 1987, p.171.
113. Grossman, Povesti, Rasskazy, Ocherki, . . .которое важнее всякой словесной формулы, p.539.
114. Ibid., p.540.

Chapter IV: Post-War Images of the Soviet Soldier

1. Gallagher, op. cit., xiv.
2. Vasilii Grossman, Za pravoe delo, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1964, p.19. Modified in the book version.
3. Ibid., p.19.
4. Ibid., p.21.
5. Ibid., p.309.
6. Bubennov, op. cit., p.4.
7. Za pravoe delo, p.16.
8. Ibid., p.17.
9. Ibid., p.15.
10. Ibid., p.24.
11. Ibid., p.604.
12. Ibid., p.16.
13. Ibid., p.661.
14. Not included in the book version. This quotation refers to journal. See Novyy mir, 10, 1952, p.142.
15. Unattributed article in Molodoy kommunist, 4, 1953, p.127.
16. Za pravoe delo, p.715.
17. Ibid., p.720.
18. Ibid., p.721.
19. Not included in the book version. See Novyy mir, 10, 1952, p.182.
20. Ortenberg, op. cit., p.153.
21. Werth, The Year of Stalingrad, p.227.
22. S. L'vov, 'Rozhdenie epopei', in Ogonyok, No 47, 1952, p.24.
23. Ibid., p.24.
24. B. Galanov, 'Epopeya narodnoy bor'by', in Molodoy kommunist, 1, 1953, p.119.
25. A. Lektorskiy, 'Roman, iskazhayushchiy obrazy sovetskikh lyudey', in Kommunist, 3, 1953, p.114.
26. Bubennov, op. cit., p.4.
27. Ibid., p.4.
28. Za pravoe delo, p.302.
29. N. Dobrotvorskiy, 'Eto ne geroi Stalingrada', in Zvezda, 5, 1953, p.187.
30. Za pravoe delo, p.716.
31. Ibid., p.715.

32. Dobrotvorskiy, op. cit., p.187.
33. Literaturnaya gazeta, 02.03.1988., pp.2-3.
34. Za pravoe delo, p.301.
35. Ibid., p.698.
36. Not included in the book version. See Novyy mir, 10, 1952, p.167.
37. Za pravoe delo, p.696.
38. Ibid., p.716.
39. Ibid., p.550.
40. Ibid., p.550.
41. Ibid., p.559.
42. Not included in the book version. See Novyy mir, 7, 1952, p.51.
43. Not included in the book version. See Ibid., p.52.
44. Za pravoe delo, p.89.
45. Ibid., p.90.
46. Not included in the book version. See Novyy mir, 7, 1952, p.59.
47. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p.502.
48. Vasiliiy Grossman, Povesti, Rasskazy, Ocherki, 1958, p.478.
49. Za pravoe delo, p.86.
50. Lektorskiy, op. cit., p.114.
51. Ibid., p.113.
52. Chapter 25 in the book version. For the incident referred to see pp. 121-123.
53. Za pravoe delo, p.493.
54. Ortenberg, op. cit., p.150.
55. Voprosy literatury, 6, 1987, pp.172-176. By the end of the war Grossman had struck up a firm friendship with Babadzhanian, who later, to Grossman's horror, took part in the suppression of the Hungarian uprising in 1956. See Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasilya Grossmana, p.28.
56. Vasiliiy Grossman, 'Sovetskiy ofitser', in Krasnaya zvezda, issues 11/14/16/20/23/. 11. 1945.
57. Voprosy literatury, 6, 1987, p.158.
58. Ibid., p.175.
59. Ibid., p.176.
60. Bubennov, op. cit., p.3.
61. Lektorskiy, op. cit., p.110.

62. Yu. Morokhovskiy, 'Nechemu uchit'sya u takhix geroev', in Zvezda, 5, 1953, 188.
63. Lektorskiy, op. cit., p.111.
64. Bubennov, op. cit., p.4.
65. Ibid., p.4.
66. Za pravoe delo, p.490.
67. Ibid., p.490.
68. Bubennov, op. cit., p.4.
69. Za pravoe delo, p.113.
70. Ibid., p.576.
71. Ibid., p.576.
72. See Gody voyny.
73. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p.168.
74. Ibid., p.168.
75. Ibid., p.168.
76. Ibid., p.157.
77. Ibid., p.157.
78. Bocharov, Oktyabr', 3, 1988, p.152.
79. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p.299.
80. Another example of this phenomenon is Vasil Bykov's 'Odna noch'. See Sobranie sochineniy, vol .4., Molodaya Gvardiya, M., 1986.
81. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p.151.
82. Ibid., p.151.
83. Ibid., p.151.
84. Ibid., p.152,
85. Vasiliiy Zaytsev, Za Volgoy zemli dlya nas ne bylo, Izdatel'stvo, DOSAF, M., 1971. A further account of Zaytsev's exploits can be found in Sergey Alekseev's Gvardeyskiy razgovor. Rasskazy iz istorii Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny, Voenizdat, M., 1979. See 'Berlinskaya znamenitost'', pp.115-117.
86. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p.152.
87. Ibid., p.152.
88. Derman discusses the snipers, specifically Chekhov, in these terms. Chekhov, he writes, becomes a, . . . 'несравненным, артистическим снайпером', op. cit., p.202.
89. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p.151.
90. Zaytsev, op. cit., p.121.

91. V. Kulish, 'Epos voyny narodnoy', in Voprosy literatury, 10, 1988, p. 32.

Chapter V: Soldiers and Commissars: Army and Party in Conflict

1. Roman Kolkowicz, The Soviet Military and The Communist Party, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1967, p. 81.
2. Ellen Jones, Red Army and Society, A Sociology of the Soviet Military, Allen and Unwin, London., 1985, p. 123.
3. John Erickson, The Soviet High Command, A Military-Political History 1918-1941, Macmillan, London, 1962.
4. Kolkowicz, op. cit., p. 57.
5. Ibid., p. 60. Quoted from Walter Duranty, The Kremlin and the People, Reynal & Hitchcock, N.Y., 1941, p. 127.
6. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p. 13.
7. Vasiliy Grossman, Staryy uchitel', Povesti i Rasskazy, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1962, p. 8.
8. Ibid., p. 8.
9. Ibid., p. 9.
10. Ibid., p. 17.
11. Ibid., p. 21.
12. Ibid., p. 23.
13. Ibid., p. 20.
14. Bocharov, Oktyabr', 3, 1988, p. 156.
15. Ibid., p. 156.
16. Irina Murav'eva, 'Dvadtsat' let spustya', in Grani, 149, 1988, p. 260. Askol'dov expands the Jewish theme in Komissar. In one scene there are explicit references to the Holocaust. Nevertheless, Murav'eva's observation still pertains to Grossman's original text.
17. Ibid., p. 265.
18. Staryy uchitel', p. 53.
19. Consider Taylor's remarks on the doctor's outburst, . . . 'the author is moving towards a more ethical evaluation of the consequences of the Civil War period. In "V gorode Berdicheve" the moral dilemma is virtually ignored.' Op. cit., p. 50.

20. Staryy uchitel', p. 51.
21. Ibid., p. 51.
22. Ibid., p. 58.
23. Ibid., p. 58.
24. Ibid., p. 25.
25. Quoted in Kolkowicz, p. 25. Von Seeckt (1866-1936) was a gifted German staff officer who served with distinction in World War One. He encouraged military cooperation between Germany and the Soviet Union in the 20s.
26. Michel Garder, A History of the Soviet Army, Pall Mall Press, London, 1959, p. 99.
27. Erickson, op. cit., p. 603.
28. Ibid., p. 603.
29. Gody voyny, p. 9.
30. Ibid., p. 10.
31. Ibid., p. 34.
32. Ibid., pp. 34-35.
33. Ibid., p. 15.
34. Derman, op cit., p. 202.
35. Ibid., p. 212.
36. Pertsov, op. cit., p. 32.
37. Ibid., p. 34.
38. Gody voyny. Consider the following: 'Богарев медленно повернулся. Лицо его было угрюмо. Выражение тяжелой упорной думы лежало на всем облике его. Худые щеки, темные глаза, сжатые губы - все напряглось в одном большом движении. « Словно икона, строгий », - подумал Игнатьев, глядя на лицо комиссара.' p. 28.
39. Bocharov, Vasiliy Grossman, p. 107.
40. A. Myasnikov, 'Literatura i voyna', in Oktyabr', 11, 1942, p. 143.
41. Gody voyny, p. 9.
42. Ibid., p. 61.
43. Derman, op. cit., p. 212.
44. Gody voyny, p. 140.
45. Bocharov, Vasiliy Grossman, p. 119.
46. Erickson, op. cit., p. 603.
47. Werth, Russia at War, p. 227. Garder maintains that dual command led to the 'robotisation' of the Red Army. Op. cit., p. 104.

48. Gody voyny, p.87.
49. Peter Henry, A Hamlet of his Time, Vsevolod Garshin, The Man, His Works, and His Milieu, Willem A. Meeuws, Oxford, 1983, p.40.
50. Pertsov, op. cit., p.29.
51. V. Kardin, 'Zhizn' - eto svoboda...', in Ogonyok, 23, 1988, p.22.
52. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p.30.
53. Za pravoe delo, p.238.
54. Ibid., p.242.
55. Ibid., p.242.
56. Ibid., p.205.
57. Ibid., p.205. The book version contains a more detailed picture of German penetration.
58. Ibid., p.205.
59. Deleted from journal version. See Novyy mir, 7, 1952, p.120.
60. The time spent by Krymov behind the German lines - 40 days (the Biblical connotations are obvious) - is almost the same period spent by Bogarev.
61. Lektorskiy, op. cit., p.111.
62. Ibid., p.111.
63. Ibid., p.111.
64. See Novyy mir, 7, 1952, p.120.
65. Bubennov, op. cit., p.4.
66. Za pravoe delo, p.205.
67. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p.29.
68. Za pravoe delo, p.222.
69. Ibid., p.221.
70. Ibid., p.292.
71. Ibid., p.293.
72. 'zaklyatyy' deleted from the book version, p.293. This is an unusual deletion considering the far more provocative comments of the old man on collectivisation, both of which were included in the journal.
73. Ibid., p.222.
74. Literaturnoe nasledstvo, p.162.
75. Za pravoe delo, p.588. With regard to the stiffening of resistance at Stalingrad Khrushchev's remarks are of interest: 'There was none of the disorderly flight which had characterised

the situation earlier in the war. Our troops were now fighting heroically and retreated only when there was no other way out.' See Khrushchev Remembers, trans., Strobe Talbot, Sphere Books Ltd, London, 1971, p.168.

76. Galanov, op. cit., p.122
77. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p.155.
78. Ibid., p.154.
79. Ibid., p.286.
80. Ibid., p.287.
81. Ibid., p.288.
82. Ibid., p.289.
83. Ibid., p.290.
84. Ibid., p.290.
85. Za pravoe delo, pp.291-292.
86. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p.291.
87. Ibid., p.291.
88. Ibid., p.291.
89. Ibid., p.292.
90. Ibid., p.292.
91. Ibid., p.292.
92. Ibid., p.292.
93. Ibid., p.292.
94. Ibid., p.293.
95. Ibid., p.293.
96. Ibid., p.353.
97. Ibid., p.353., . . . Генсек [...] объявлен непогрешимым, чуть ли не божественным!
98. Ibid., p.353. Krymov's behaviour, and indeed that of other commissars, is in stark contrast to Yosef Avidar's assessment: 'In the dark hours of October 1942, Stalin put the Party political machine to work to support the Commanders and not to harrass them.' See The Party and The Army in the Soviet Union, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1985, p.39.
99. Ibid., p.354.
100. Ibid., p.363.
101. Ibid., p.363.
102. Ibid., p.363.

103. Ibid., p. 353.
104. Ibid., p. 293.
105. Ibid., p. 441.
106. Ibid., p. 441.
107. Zolotusskiy, op. cit., p. 4.
108. Ibid., p. 4.
109. Bocharov, 'Chast' pravdy - eto ne pravda', in Oktyabr', 4, 1988, p. 145.
110. Kardin, op. cit., p. 23.
111. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 293.
112. Ibid., p. 353.
113. D. Piper, op. cit., p. 169.
114. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 212.
115. Ibid., p. 199.
116. Ibid., p. 212.
117. Ibid., p. 209.
118. Ibid., p. 199.
119. Ibid., p. 366.
120. Ibid., p. 213.
121. Ibid., p. 213.
122. Ibid., p. 60.
123. Ibid., p. 60.
124. Ibid., p. 60.
125. Ibid., p. 61.
126. Ibid., p. 65.
127. See for example Khrushchev, op. cit. Grossman refers to Khrushchev in Zhizn' i sud'ba, pp. 61-62.
128. Ibid., p. 62.
129. Ibid., p. 63.
130. Ibid., p. 63.
131. Ibid., p. 63.
132. Ibid., p. 64.
133. Ibid., p. 69. . . . 'он легко находил ту правильную линию'. One can only agree with Markish's comment that Getmanov is, . . . 'a literary achievement of the first magnitude'. See Commentary, p. 45.
134. Ibid., p. 140.

135. Ibid., p. 140.
136. Ibid., p. 140.
137. Ibid., p. 141.
138. V. Oskostkiy, Voprosy literatury, 10, 1988, p. 64.
139. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p. 61.
140. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 230.
141. Ibid., p. 230.
142. Ibid., p. 143. . . . 'оба эти человека [. . .] были объединены какой-то прочной общностью'.
143. Ibid., p. 225.
144. Ibid., p. 145.
145. Ibid., p. 145.
146. Ibid., p. 227.
147. Ibid., p. 142.
148. Ibid., p. 226.
149. Ibid., p. 229.
150. Ibid., p. 230.
151. Ibid., p. 143.
152. Ibid., p. 344.
153. Ibid., p. 349.
154. Ibid., p. 346.
155. Ibid., p. 349.
156. Ibid., p. 346.
157. Ibid., p. 346.
158. Ibid., p. 348.
159. G. Svirskiy, 'Vosem' minut svobody', in Grani, 136, 1985, p. 304.
160. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 448.
161. Ibid., p. 563.
162. Ibid., p. 566.
163. Kardin, op. cit., p. 23.
164. Bocharov, Oktyabr', 4, 1988, p. 145.
165. Ibid., p. 146.

Chapter VI: Concepts of War and Progress.

1. Filosofskoe nasledie V. I. Lenina, p. 14.
2. Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, t., 21., 3 ed, p. 29. . . .

от антагонистичности, противоречий прежних формаций.

3. Stepan Kol'chugin, p. 596.
4. Theodor Gomperz, Greek Thinkers. A History of Ancient Philosophy, Vol., 1, London., 1901, p. 140. According to Markish the Russian translation appeared between 1911-13 and enjoyed considerable popularity (Markish, Na evreyskie temy, vol., 2., p. 404.) G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven offer a slightly different translation to the one quoted from Gomperz. The variation occurs at the beginning: 'If one were to believe the Pythagoreans, that events recur in an arithmetical circle'... Thereafter the two translations concur. See The Pre-Socratic Philosophers. A Critical Study With a Selection of Texts, CUP., 1957, p. 223. This text was the primary source of information on the Pythagoreans, in particular the discussion on limit and unlimit.
5. Stepan Kol'chugin, p. 340.
6. Znamya, 7, 1946, p. 75.
7. Ibid., p. 87.
8. Ibid., p. 75.
9. Dobro Vam!, 1967, p. 82.
10. Znamya, 7, 1946, p. 74.
11. Ibid., p. 76.
12. Ibid., p. 76.
13. Ibid., p. 76.
14. J. B. Bury, The Idea of Progress. An Enquiry into its Origins, and Growth, Macmillan, London., 1928, p. 4.
15. Znamya, 7, 1946, p. 76.
16. Mikhail Heller, Cogs in the Soviet Wheel. The Formation of Soviet Man, trans., David Floyd, Collins, London., 1988, p. 71.
17. Znamya, 7, 1946, p. 73.
18. Igor Ded'kov, 'Zhizn' protiv sud'by', in Novyy mir, 11, 1988, p. 237.
19. Vse techet, p. 148.
20. Znamya, 7, 1946, p. 82.
21. Ibid., p. 104.
22. Vladimir Ermilov, 'Vrednaya p'esa', in Samaya demokraticeskaya literatura mira, Stat'i 1946-47gg, M., 1947, p. 33. The original

article appeared in Pravda, 04.09.1946.

23. Ibid., p. 38.
24. Ibid., p. 32.
25. Unattributed article in Znamya, 'Vyshe znamya ideynosti v literature', 10, 1946, p. 31.
26. Ermilov, op. cit., p. 32.
27. Russian translation Zakat Evropy, M., 1923. Among the secondary literature is the following: O. Shpengler i Zakat Evropy, M., 1922, V. N. Lazarev.
28. Oswald Spengler, Der Untergang des Abendlandes. Umriss einer Morphologie der Weltgeschichte, Verlag C. H. Beck, Munchen., 1980, p. 157.
29. Ibid., p. 154.
30. Ibid., p. 157.
31. Markish, Na evreyskie temy, vol. 2., p. 403.
32. Ibid., p. 404.
33. Markish, Commentary, p. 42.
34. Ibid., p. 42.
35. Heller, op. cit., p. 66.
36. Gleb Struve, Russian Literature under Lenin and Stalin. 1917-53, Oklahoma University Press, Oklahoma, 1971, p. 351.
37. See Struve's review of Vse techet, op. cit., p. 944.
38. E. Etkind, '1946 god: Krushenie nadezhd', in Vremya i my, 89, 1986, p. 180.
39. Ibid., p. 180.
40. Znamya, 7, 1946, p. 96.
41. Kirk and Raven, op. cit., p. 186.
42. Znamya, 7, 1946, p. 96.
43. B. Walker, The Annals of Tacitus. A Study in the Writing of History, Manchester University Press, Manchester., 1951, p. 21.
44. Anninskiy, op. cit., p. 260.
45. See D. R. Dudley, The World of Tacitus, Secker & Warberg, London., 1968. I am grateful to Mr Thomas Wiedemann for drawing my attention to this.
46. Dudley, op. cit., p. 236.
47. Quoted by P. Burke in Tacitus, Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence, ed., T. A. Dorey, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.,

1969, p. 164. It is worth noting that this volume is dedicated to the people of Czechoslovakia. Burke's concluding remarks are especially relevant to Tacitus in Grossman: 'In the twentieth century too, Tacitus has his uses; for despotism has come round a third time. Hugh Trevor-Roper and Golo Mann have written about Hitler in the Tacitean tradition. In Eastern Europe, a Tacitean mask has sometimes been useful to writers prepared to take more risks than Lipsius.' p. 170.

48. Gody voyny, p. 220.
49. Ibid., p. 346.
50. Ibid., p. 346.
51. Ibid., p. 359.
52. Grossman, Povesti, Rasskazy, Ocherki, 1958, pp. 539-40.
53. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p. 15.
54. Znamya, 7, 1946, p. 68.
55. Gallagher, op. cit., xiv.
56. Etkind, Vremya i my, 89, 1986, p. 185.
57. Ibid., p. 185.
58. Gody voyny, p. 25,
59. Ibid., p. 26.
60. Dobro Vam!, p. 82.
61. Gody voyny, p. 25.
62. Ibid., p. 26.
63. Ibid., p. 30.
64. Ibid., p. 30.
65. Derman, op. cit., p. 205.
66. Za pravoe delo, p. 439.
67. Gody voyny, p. 31.
68. Filosofskoe nasledie V. I. Lenina, p. 14.
69. Walker, op. cit., p. 195. The cyclical idea can also be found in Tacitus' writing: 'And perhaps there is a kind of cycle in human affairs, whereby manners have their revolutions like the seasons.' See Annals of Tacitus, trans., G. G. Ramsay, Macmillan, London., 1904, iii. 55. vi.
70. Literaturnoe nasledstvo, p. 159. Ernst Jünger describes war in these terms. War, he argues, is, . . . 'ein Gottesurteil über zwei Ideen.' Op. cit., p. 48.

71. Dobro Vam!, p. 34.
72. Ibid., p. 37.
73. Ibid., p. 38.
74. Ibid., p. 38.
75. Ibid., p. 30.
76. Ibid., p. 43.
77. Ibid., p. 45.
78. Ibid., p. 45.
79. Ibid., p. 47.
80. Ibid., p. 47.
81. Ibid., p. 50.
82. Ibid., p. 50.
83. Ibid., p. 50.
84. Bocharov, Chelovek na voyne, p. 161.
85. Ibid., p. 161.
86. See Sakharov's comments in an interview in Ogonyok, 8, 1989, p. 7.
87. Dobro Vam!, p. 48.
88. God XVII. Al'manakh 4, Goslitizdat, M., 1934, p. 5.
89. Ibid., p. 70.
90. Stepan Kol'chugin, p. 268.
91. Znamya, 4, 1987, p. 142.
92. Stepan Kol'chugin, p. 166.
93. Ibid., p. 253.
94. Ibid., p. 271.
95. Ibid., p. 191.
96. Ibid., p. 191.
97. Ibid., p. 193. This is a reworking of the well known proverb: 'курица не птица, а женщина не человек'.
98. Ibid., p. 214.
99. Ibid., p. 214.
100. Absent from book version. See Novyy mir, 7, 1952, p. 83.
101. Ibid., p. 102.
102. Ibid., p. 102.
103. Gody voyny, p. 148.
104. Novyy mir, 7, 1952, p. 102.
105. Ibid., p. 103.
106. Ibid., p. 104.

107. Bubennov, op. cit., p.3.
108. Ibid., p.3.
109. Molodoy kommunist, 4, 1953, p.127.
110. Ibid., p.127.
111. Lektorskiy, op. cit., p.107.
112. Za pravoe delo, p.185.
113. Lektorskiy, op. cit., p.107.
114. Ibid., p.108.
115. Ibid., p.109.
116. Zvezda, 5, 1953, p.186.
117. Novyy mir, 7, 1952, p.101.
118. Lektorskiy, op. cit., p.108.
119. Novyy mir, 7, 1952, 104.
120. Ibid., p.104.
121. Ibid., p.104.
122. An idea, which in the seventies and early eighties, has been developed by Alvin Toffler in his book, The Third Wave, Collins, London., 1980.
123. N. Anatol'eva, 'V neravnom boyu', in Grani, 18, 1953, p.114.
124. Ibid., p.114.
125. Ibid., p.110.
126. Za pravoe delo, p.151.
127. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p.310.
128. Ibid., p.46.
129. Ibid., p.55. Shtrum would appear to divorce himself from the remarks he makes in the book version of Za pravoe delo about Chepyzhin's theories.
130. Ibid., p.45.
131. Ibid., p.403.
132. Ibid., p.403.
133. Hannah Arendt, The Origins of Totalitarianism, Harcourt Brace & Jovanovich, N.Y. & London, 1973, p.387.
134. I. Kuz'michev, Zametki o sovremennom voennom romane', in Oktyabr', 3, 1965, p.186.
135. Bocharov, 'Istoki pobedy', in Znamya, 5, 1965, p.234.
136. Ibid., p.234.
137. Voprosy literatury, 5, 1985. See answers to questionnaire.

138. Ibid., p. 30.
139. L'vov & Galanov, op. cit.
140. L'vov, op. cit., p. 24.
141. Anatol'eva, op. cit., p. 112.
142. Bubennov, op. cit., p. 4.
143. Konstantin Simonov, 'Chitaya Tolstogo', in Novyy mir, 11, 1969, p. 163. Consider Thun's comments: 'Die Ähnlichkeit, die häufig zwischen Krieg und Frieden und sowjetischen Romanen über den Grossen Vaterländischen Krieg gesehen werde, könne nur im übertragenen Sinne verstanden werden.' Op cit., p. 51.
144. Simonov, op. cit., p. 162.
145. Ibid., p. 163.
146. Bocharov, Vasiliy Grossman, p. 183.
147. H. Ermolaev, Mikhail Sholokhov and his Art, Princeton University Press, 1982, p. 90.
148. Plotkin, op. cit., p. 184.
149. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p. 50. With regard to Za pravoe delo Lipkin has observed: 'Параллель с планом "Войны и Мира" была откровенным приемом и приемом осталась.' Continuing, he adds: 'Степени сравнения с "Войной и миром" достигает не "За правое дело", а "Жизнь и судьба"...' op. cit., p. 25.
150. Bocharov, 'Pravoe delo Vasiliya Grossmana', in Oktyabr', 1, 1988, p. 128. See too Voynovich, op. cit., p. 53.
151. Anninskiy, op. cit., p. 256.
152. Oskotskiy, op. cit., p. 29.
153. Literaturnoe nasledstvo, p. 162. In "Anyuta", one of Grossman's wartime rasskazy, a Russian officer says of War and Peace: 'Это не книга, а великий океан'. Povesti i rasskazy, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1950, p. 463.
154. Tolstoy, Sobranie sochineniy, vol. 6, p. 50.
155. Tolstoy, vol. 3, p. 226.
156. Gody voyny, p. 124.
157. Ibid., p. 124.
158. Quoted by Bocharov in Vasiliy Grossman, p. 144. Bocharov quotes from Grossman's wartime diaries. The hiatus in the quotation suggests that Grossman had a lot more to say on this matter, publication of which in 1970 was not permitted. The combination

of the sub-conscious and conscious, the rational and irrational, characterises much of Shtrum's intellectual activity. Shtrum talks of the, . . . 'горючий торф подсознания', Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 235.

159. Gody voyny, p. 456.

160. Ibid., p. 455.

161. D-503 uses the 'wild curve' as a symbol of the irrational, whereas the straight line is associated with orthodoxy. See Evgeniy Zamyatin, My, Mezhdunarodnoe Literaturnoe Sodruzhestvo, N.Y., 1967, p. 5.

162. Spengler, op. cit., p. 83.

163. Ibid., p. 118.

164. Gody voyny, p. 414.

165. Povesti, Rasskazy, Ocherki, 1958.

166. Graham D. Vernon, ed., Soviet Perceptions of War and Peace, National Defense University Press, Washington, 1981, p. 20.

167. Vigor's comments are worth quoting: 'If, then, surprise is an important factor in ensuring victory in war, Stalin, by allowing the Germans to achieve it, had shown himself to be fallible. Therefore it had to be proclaimed to the Russian people that surprise is not a factor of major importance.' Op. cit., p. 107.

168. Gody voyny, p. 329.

169. Ibid., p. 381.

170. Tolstoy, Sobranie sochineniy, vol. 6, p. 300.

171. Ibid., p. 50.

172. Ibid., p. 63.

173. Consider Pietro Citati's comments: 'Napoleon's true glory is that of a writer: he is the genius of empty and brilliant rhetoric, of the intellectual formula, the epigraphic sentence that seems to contain some mysterious profound substance and actually contains only wind.', in Tolstoy, trans., Raymond Rosenthal, Schocken, N.Y., 1986, p. 137.

174. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 443.

175. Ibid., p. 443.

176. Isaiah Berlin, The Hedgehog and the Fox. An Essay on Tolstoy's View of History, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London., 1967, p. 21.

177. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 443.

178. Istoriya Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny, t.3, p.65.
179. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p.457.
180. Tolstoy, Sobranie sochineniy, t.7, p.137.
181. In "Anyuta" we find the interesting observation: 'Лаплас мечтал составить дифференциальное уравнение, которое могло бы объять и законы движения небесных тел. Вот, мне думается, наш Лев Толстой достиг этого. Ему все понятно. Op. cit., p.463.
182. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p.443-444.
183. Ibid., p.444.
184. John Polkinghorne, a distinguished physicist, tends to support this argument: 'I am somewhat of an adherent to the 'great man' theory of the history of science - that it is the insights of the men of genius which really propel the subject - but even those of us who only belong to the army of honest toilers share in the excitement as the pattern of nature is laid bare to human enquiry.' See Science and Creation, SPCK, L., 1988, p.xi.
185. Tolstoy, Sobranie sochineniy, t.6, p.7.
186. Ibid., p.285.
187. Za pravoe delo, pp.14-15. A similar idea can be found in the wartime sketch, "Iyul' 1943 goda". Of the battle for the Kursk salient Grossman observes: 'Не Гитлер движет войну 1943 года, а война движет Гитлера и его генералитет.' Gody voyny, p.330.
188. Tolstoy, Sobranie sochineniy, vol. 6, p.239. Grossman was well aware of the shortcomings of treaties to regulate war. Mostovskoy is confronted with their failure by Sofya Levinton, who herself dies in the gas chamber: 'Вот вам и двадцатый век, вот вам и человеческая культура. Невиданное зверство! Вот вам и Гаагские конвенции о гуманных методах ведения войны, о защите гражданского населения. Все к черту! ... Товарищ Мостовской, вы посмотрите на эти развалины. Какая уж тут вера в будущее, техника прогрессирует, но, этика, мораль, гуманность - никак, это какой-то каменный век. Фашизм возродил первобытные зверства, прыжок в прошлое на пятьдесят тысяч лет...', in Za pravoe delo, p.481. Levinton makes the same point in Zhizn' i sud'ba, . . . 'Ужасно звучал язык Гете на ночных русских полустанках', p.127.
189. Tolstoy, vol. 6, p.239.
190. See Filosofskoe nasledie V. I. Lenina, pp.261-262. Pfuel's and

Napoleon's obsession with theory is also shared by Marxist thinkers on war, and thus Tolstoy's criticism poses a problem for Soviet theory. Tolstoy's demotion of Napoleon has implications for Lenin's alleged greatness on the world stage, and may explain the unusual sensitivity to Tolstoy's invective on the part of certain Soviet scholars and writers. See Simonov, op. cit., p.171., and Ya. S. Lur'e, 'Differentsial istorii v Voynе i mire', in Russkaya literatura, 3, 1978, pp.43-60. In certain case there have been blatant and crude attempts to enlist Tolstoy's support against Soviet writers, specifically the Remarquists. Witness the following: 'Ведь та « правда », которая по словам Толстого была главным героем его « Севастопольских рассказов » и которую в еще большей мере можно назвать героем « Войны и мира » заключается не только в том, чтобы показать ужас войны, и в убеждении, что любые жертвы, которых требует справедливая война, оправданы той великой целью, во имя которой она ведется.' See E. Kolpakova, 'Literature na voyne', in Voprosy literatury, 8, 1957, p.64.

191. Stepan Kol'chugin, p.613.
192. Ibid., p.613.
193. Ibid., p.552.
194. Ibid., p.552.
195. Ibid., p.563.
196. Lavrova, op. cit., p.207.
197. Stepan Kol'chugin, p.643.
198. Ibid., p.644.
199. Ibid., p.643.
200. E. H. Carr, What is History?, Penguin, Middlesex., 1974, p.89.
201. Bocharov, Vasilii Grossman, p.125.
202. Elliot Mossman's comment pertains to Grossman: 'War and Peace and Dr Zhivago suggest that the Russian novelist tends to select metaphors from science, and, in particular, from the scientific thought dominant in the novelist's intellectual experience. See 'Metaphors of History in 'War and Peace' and 'Dr Zhivago', in Literature and History, ed, Gary Saul Morson, Stanford University Press, California, 1986, p.247.
203. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p.21. One is reminded here of Tushin in

Voyna i mir.

204. Ibid., p. 22.

205. Ibid., p. 22.

206. Gody voyny, p. 30.

207. Zhizn' i sud'ba, pp. 22-23.

208. Gody voyny, p. 204.

209. Ibid., p. 398.

210. Bubennov, op. cit., p. 3.

211. Gody voyny, p. 172. Similar sentiments regarding the emotional significance of the Volga are to be found in Simonov's Dni i noch'i. Saburov, Simonov's hero, expresses this deep reverence: . . . 'с детства, со школы, всю жизнь Волга была для него чем-то таким глубинным, таким бесконечно русским... See Sobranie sochineniy, vol. 2, p. 19.

212. Gody voyny, p. 277.

213. Ibid., p. 263.

214. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 458.

Chapter VII: Inside the Totalitarian State

1. See for example Alan Bullock, Hitler: A Study in Tyranny, Penguin, Middlesex., 1983, William L. Shirer, The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich, Pan Books, London., 1964, Robert Conquest, The Great Terror, Macmillan, London., 1968, C. J. Friedrich and Z. K. Brzezinski, Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy, Cambridge., 1956.
2. Quoted by Hannah Arendt in The Origins of Totalitarianism, p. 376. From Alexandre Koyré, 'The Political Function of the Modern Lie', in Contemporary Jewish Record, 6, 1945.
3. C. J. Friedrich. Quoted in Betty B. Burch, (ed) Dictatorship and Totalitarianism, D. Van Nostrand Company, Princeton., 1964, p. 180
4. Ibid., p. 180.
5. Markish, Commentary, p. 41.
6. There is no evidence to suggest that Grossman attempted to publish these rasskazy before the war.
7. Dobro vam!, p. 157.
8. Ibid., p. 161.

9. Soviet Germans: Past and Present, ed., Edith Rogovin Frankel, London., 1986, p.47. Consider, too, the fate of Jenny Henrichovna in Zhizn' i sud'ba. An ethnic German, she is arrested. See p.72.
10. A suggestion made by Rosalind Marsh. See Soviet Fiction Since Stalin: Science, Politics and Literature, Croom Helm, London., 1986, p.222. The work which most closely accords with Marsh's analysis would be Grossman's "Obval", first published in Moskva, 5, 1966, pp68-74. Written a year before he died, "Obval" is a searching examination of death and its impact on the living.
11. L. Saltovskaya, 'Shchemyashchaya nota', in Oktyabr', 8, 1963, p.218.
12. Dobro vam!, p.117.
13. Bocharov, Vasiliy Grossman, p.283.
14. Isaac Deutscher, Stalin, A Political Biography, Pelican, Middlessex., 1979, p.35.
15. Dobro Vam!, p.113. Very severe criticism in other words.
16. Ibid., p.114. . . . 'что дело тут не только в мнительности больного человека'.
17. Ibid., p.116.
18. Ibid., p.116.
19. Ibid., p.118.
20. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p.13. See too F. Guber, 'Pamyat' i pis'ma', in Trud, 20.10.1989, p.3.
21. Ibid., p.13.
22. Ibid., p.13.
23. Saltovskaya's word, op. cit., p.216.
24. Dobro vam!, p.120.
25. Ibid., p.120.
26. Ibid., p.111.
27. Saltovskaya, op. cit., p.218.
28. Ibid., p.218.
29. Ibid., p.218.
30. Hannah Arendt, The Origins of Totalitarianism, p.475.
31. Dobro vam!, p.100.
32. Ibid., p.100.
33. Ibid., p.101.

34. Ibid., p. 102.
35. Ibid., p. 103.
36. Ibid., p. 103.
37. Ibid., p. 96.
38. Ibid., p. 101. просто жизнь ее подчиналась этому захватывающему дух движению
39. Ibid., p. 99.
40. Ibid., p. 105.
41. Bocharov, 'Bolevye zony', in Oktyabr', 2, 1988, p. 106.
42. Deutscher, op. cit., p. 341.
43. Dobro vam!, p. 106.
44. Ibid., p. 106.
45. Ibid., p. 71.
46. Ibid., p. 72.
47. Ibid., p. 72.
48. Cf. 'государственный гранит' in Za pravoe delo, p. 408.
49. Dobro vam!, p. 85.
50. Ibid., p. 81.
51. Ibid., p. 77.
52. Ibid., p. 81.
53. Ibid., p. 77.
54. Ibid., p. 81.
55. Ibid., p. 83.
56. Ibid., p. 93.
57. Bocharov, Vasiliy Grossman, p. 279.
58. Dobro vam!, p. 71. Pushkin wrote a total of five poems under this title. This particular one was written in 1830.
59. Ibid., p. 94.
60. Bocharov, Vasiliy Grossman, p. 280.
61. Dobro vam!, p. 79.
62. Bocharov, Vasiliy Grossman, p. 280.
63. Stepan Kol'chugin, p. 670.
64. Ibid., p. 667.
65. Ibid., p. 663.
66. Ibid., p. 677.
67. Taylor, op. cit., p. 70.
68. Ibid., p. 71.

69. Ibid., p. 71.
70. Ibid., p. 74.
71. Stepan Kol'chugin, p. 340.
72. Ibid., p. 340.
73. Taylor, op. cit., p. 51.
74. Literaturnaya gazeta, 24.08.1988., p. 5.
75. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p. 11.
76. Ibid., p. 11.
77. Ibid., p. 11.
78. Zhizn' i sud'ba, Shtrum's comments on the treatment of exiles make the point. See p. 528.
79. Za pravoe delo, p. 158.
80. Ibid. p. 158.
81. Edith Rogovin Frankel, 'Literature in Stalin's Last Year', in Soviet Studies, 3, 1976, p. 397.
82. Za pravoe delo, p. 423.
83. Ibid., p. 75.
84. Ibid., p. 76.
85. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p. 27.
86. Za pravoe delo, p. 425.
87. Ibid., p. 426.
88. Ibid., p. 427.
89. Ibid., p. 407.
90. Ibid., p. 409.
91. Ibid., p. 430.
92. Ibid., p. 431.
93. Ibid., p. 432.
94. Этот параллелизм намечен еще в книге « За правое дело ». Roskina op. cit., p. 118.
95. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p. 30.
96. Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Arkhipelag Gulag 1918-1956, vols. I-II YMCA-Press, Paris., 1973, p. 37.
97. A theme of major importance for Luntz in Za pravoe delo. See p. 422.
98. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 3.
99. Ibid., p. 137.
100. Ibid., p. 138.

101. Ibid., p. 118.
102. Ibid., p. 119.
103. Hannah Arendt, The Origins of Totalitarianism, p. 307.
104. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 121.
105. Za pravoe delo, p. 130.
106. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 119.
107. Za pravoe delo, p. 130.
108. Ibid., p. 132.
109. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 113.
110. Ibid., p. 123.
111. Ibid., p. 201. The reference to Lenin is not included in the Soviet book version.
112. Ibid., p. 201.
113. Ibid., p. 201.
114. Ibid., p. 269.
115. Ibid., p. 269.
116. Ibid., p. 269.
117. Ibid., p. 270.
118. Ibid., p. 274.
119. Roskina, op. cit., p. 114.
120. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 271.
121. Reißner, op. cit., p. 10.
122. Consider Grossman's 'диктатура расы' in Za pravoe delo, p. 427.
123. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 272.
124. Ibid., p. 272.
125. Ibid., p. 275.
126. Ibid., p. 55.
127. Ibid., p. 55.
128. Ibid., p. 271.
129. Ibid., p. 273.
130. Ibid., p. 275.
131. Ibid., p. 273.
132. Bocharov, Oktyabr', 2, 1988, p. 108.
133. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 456.
134. E. Etkind, 'Zhizn' i sud'ba knigi', in Vremya i my, 101, 1988, p. 201.
135. Ibid., p. 201.

136. Bocharov, Oktyabr', 2, 1988, p. 109.
137. Ibid., p. 108.
138. Ibid., p. 108.
139. Kulish, op. cit., p. 71.
140. Bocharov, Oktyabr', 2, 1988, p. 109.
141. Ibid., p. 109.
142. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 271. Oskotskiy's views are generally in line with this argument. Op. cit., p. 82.
143. Ibid., p. 366.
144. Ibid., p. 273.
145. Zolotusskiy, op. cit., p. 4.
146. Hannah Arendt, The Origins of Totalitarianism, p. 316.
147. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 183.
148. Ibid., p. 184.
149. Ibid., p. 185.
150. Ibid., p. 527. One wonders whether this owes anything to Tvardovskiy's change of heart regarding Za pravoe delo.
151. Ibid., p. 528.
152. Ibid., p. 528.
153. Heller argues a convincing parallel in method between Stalin's telephone call to Shtrum and Gorbachev's to Sakharov.
Op. cit., p. 18.
154. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 534.
155. Ibid., p. 184.
156. Ibid., p. 573.
157. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p. 43.
158. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 587.
159. Ibid., p. 277.
160. Ibid., p. 279.
161. Ibid., p. 277.
162. Ibid., p. 280.
163. Ibid., p. 278.
164. Roskina, op. cit., p. 108.
165. Markish, vol. 2, p. 389.
166. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 7.
167. Stepan Kol'chugin, p. 604.
168. Ibid., p. 604.

169. Ibid., p. 604.
170. Za pravoe delo, p. 184.
171. Quoted by Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p. 143.
172. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 1.
173. Lipkin, op. cit., p. 143.
174. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 276.
175. Leech-Ansprach, op. cit., photocopy, page number obscured.
176. Spengler's comments are of interest: '"Schicksal" klingt wie eine Fanfare, "ssudjba" knickt ein.' Op. cit., p. 921.
177. Znamya, 7, 1946, p. 97. Compare this with Heraclitus: 'Man's character is his fate'. See The Art and Thought of Heraclitus Charles H. Kahn, CUP, Cambridge., 1979, p. 81.
178. Gody voyny, p. 427.
179. Ibid., p. 492.
180. Ibid., p. 194.
181. G. Pomerants, 'Chto skazat' Iovu', in Strana i mir, 48, 1988, p. 140.
182. Lipkin, op. cit., p. 143.
183. Reißner, op. cit., p. 13.
184. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 8.
185. Za pravoe delo, p. 670.
186. Ibid., p. 670.
187. Ibid., p. 672. The journal version differs slightly on this point, yet is consistent with the interpretation offered. See Novyy mir, 10, 1952, p. 149.
188. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 509.
189. Ibid., p. 520.
190. Vse techet, p. 21.
191. Ibid., p. 31.
192. Ibid., p. 32.
193. Ibid., p. 34.
194. Ibid., p. 38.
195. Ibid., p. 39.
196. Ibid., p. 39., . . . показался ему чужим, недобрым, враждебным.
197. Ibid., p. 43.
198. Ibid., p. 43.
199. Ibid., p. 43.

200. Ibid., p. 43.
201. Ibid., p. 58.
202. Ibid., p. 73.
203. Ibid., p. 74.
204. Ibid., p. 74.
205. Ibid., p. 116.
206. Ibid., p. 118.
207. Heller, op. cit., p. 103.
208. Hannah Arendt, The Origins of Totalitarianism, p. 349.
209. Vse techet, p. 125. These are sentiments similar to those expressed in connection with Dmitriy Petrovich's illness in "Los'".
210. Ibid., p. 127.
211. Paul Johnson, A History of the Modern World, p. 277.
212. Vse techet, p. 133.
213. Ibid., p. 60.
214. Ibid., p. 62.
215. Ibid., p. 63.
216. Ibid., p. 63.
217. Ibid., p. 66.
218. Ibid., p. 66.
219. Ibid., p. 67.
220. Ibid., p. 70.
221. Ibid., p. 70.
222. Ibid., p. 70.
223. Ibid., p. 71.
224. Ibid., p. 90.
225. Ibid., p. 91.
226. Ibid., p. 91.
227. Ibid., p. 98.
228. Ibid., p. 99.
229. Ibid., p. 107.
230. Ibid., p. 97.
231. Ibid., p. 113.
232. Ibid., p. 167.
233. Ibid., p. 169.
234. Ibid., p. 154.

235. Ibid., p. 157.
236. Ibid., p. 175.
237. Ibid., p. 178.
238. Ibid., p. 178.
239. Ibid., p. 178.
240. Ibid., p. 178.
241. Ibid., p. 179.
242. Ibid., p. 179.
243. Ibid., p. 180.
244. Ibid., p. 180.
245. Ibid., p. 180.
246. Ibid., p. 181.
247. Ibid., p. 185.
248. Ibid., p. 181.
249. Ibid., p. 56.
250. Ibid., p. 56. Stalin's statue in Erevan reminds Grossman and us of the unchanging nature of the individual/autocrat relationship. Stalin is not a bronze god on a horse, but a, . . . 'бронзовый бог в шинели'. See "Dobro vam!", in Znamya, 11, 1988, p. 8
251. Ibid., p. 56.
252. Ibid., p. 182.
253. Quoted by Markish in Commentary, p. 47.
254. A. Stolypin, 'Oshibochnaya istoricheskaya kontseptsiya V. Grossmana', in Grani, 80, 1971, p. 217.
255. Vse techet, p. 182.
256. Stolypin, op. cit., p. 223.
257. Ibid., p. 252.
258. Markish, 'Lyubil li Rossiya V. Grossman?', in Russkaya mysl', 21.02.1986., p. 12.
259. Ibid., p. 12.
260. Ibid., p. 12.
261. Lipkin, Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, p. 98.
262. Apart from the deletion already quoted see the title of the article written by a camp inmate: 'Государство Ленина-Сталина'. Zhizn' i sud'ba, p. 119.
263. G. Vodolazov, 'Lenin i Stalin, Filosofsko-sotsiologicheskiiy

- kommentariy k povesti V. Grossmana « Vse techet », in Oktyabr', 6, 1989, p. 3.
264. Ibid., p. 7.
265. Ibid., p. 7.
266. Ibid., p. 9.
267. Ibid., p. 9.
268. Ibid., p. 10.
269. Ibid., p. 11.
270. Ibid., p. 12.
271. Vse techet, p. 190.
272. Ibid., p. 186.
273. Vodolazov, op. cit., p. 13.
274. Ibid., p. 17.
275. Ibid., p. 15.
276. Ibid., p. 19.
277. Ibid., p. 26.
278. Vse techet, p. 192.
279. Ibid., p. 195.
280. Yet consider Johnson's description of the purges as the, . . . 'dramaturgy of terror'. A History of the Modern World ., p. 266.
281. Lipkin, op. cit., p. 131.
282. Paul Johnson, A History of the Modern World, p. 708.
283. A maxim which first appears in "Chetyre dnya". See Staryy uchitel', p. 71.

Concluding Remarks.

1. Markish, Commentary, p. 41. Note too the comments from the Swiss publishers of Zhizn' i sud'ba: 'Но автор « Жизнь и судьба » и « Все течет... » не имеет почти ничего общего с тем Василием Гроссманом, который написал « Степана Кольчугина » и « За правое дело »'. See 'Ot izdatel'stva', p. iii.
2. George Steiner, Real Presences, Faber & Faber, London, 1989, p. 44.
3. Geoffrey Hosking, A History of the Soviet Union, Fontana Press/Collins, London., 1985, p. 261.
4. Max Hayward, Writers in Russia, ed., Patricia Blake, Harvill

Press, London, 1983, p.120.

5. Piper, op. cit., p.159.

6. Zhizn' i sud' ba, p.139.

Bibliography: Part I

Vasiliy Grossman: Primary Sources.

Novels

"Glück auf!" in God XVII. Al'manakh, 4, Goslitizdat, M., 1934, pp. 5-125.

Stepan Kol'chugin, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1951

'Za pravoe delo', in Novyy mir, Nos 7-10, 1952. Novyy mir, 7, 1952, pp. 1-131; 8, pp. 74-227; 9, 5-122; 10, 128-209. There have been five editions of Za pravoe delo since its publication in Novyy mir. Voenizdat, 1954, 1955, 1959, and Sovetskiy pisatel' 1956 and 1964. Throughout this study the 1964 edition has been used in conjunction with the journal version.

To date there are three separate publications of Zhizn' i sud'ba in Russian: Zhizn' i sud'ba, L'Age d'Homme, Switzerland, 1980; 'Zhizn' i sud'ba, in Oktyabr', Nos 1-4, 1988; Zhizn' i sud'ba, Knizhnaya palata, M., 1988. Extracts of Zhizn' i sud'ba were also published in the journal Kontinent in the seventies. They were published under the title of Za pravoe delo. See "Za pravoe delo", glavy iz vtoroy knigi romana', chapters 21-24, Pt. 1, in Kontinent, 4, 1975. Chapters 40-51, Pt. 1, in Kontinent, 5, 1975. Chapters 42-49, Pt. 1, in Kontinent, 6, 1976. Chapters 70-72, Pt. 1, in Kontinent, 7, 1976. Chapters 1-4, Pt. 2, in Kontinent, 8, 1976. Translations of Zhizn' i sud'ba consulted for this study were; Life and Fate, trans., Robert Chandler, Collins/Harvill, London., 1985; Leben und Schicksal, trans., Madeleine von Ballestrem, Albrecht Klaus Verlag, Munich and Hamburg., 1984.

Vse techet, Possev-Verlag, Frankfurt/Main, 2nd ed., 1974. 'Vse techet', in Oktyabr', 6, 1989, pp. 30-108. Extracts of Vse techet were published in Grani, 78, 1970, pp. 3-33. (Chapters 7 & 14).

Povesti and rasskazy.

Narod bessmertn, Ogiz, M., 1943.

Povesti i rasskazy, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1950.

Povesti, Rasskazy, Ocherki, Voenizdat, M., 1958. This volume together with the 1946 and 1950 collections was the main source for Grossman's

wartime povesti, rasskazy and ocherki, as well as the pre-war works such as 'V gorode Berdicheve', 'Chetyre dnya', and 'Mechta'.

Two further post-war collections are Staryy uchitel'. Povesti i rasskazy, M., 1962, and Dobro vam!, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1967. The latter is particularly important since it contains those works written before the war but not published until the sixties. 'Molodaya i staraya' was first published in Moskva, 9, 1964, pp. 97-104. 'Los' was first published in Moskva, 1, 1963, pp. 115-120. 'Neskol'ko pechal'nykh dney' was first published in Novyy mir, 12, 1963, pp. 45-59. In addition to the censored version of 'Dobro vam!' the volume includes 'Tiergarten', and 'Avel'. shestoe avgusta'.

'V bol'shom kol'tse' and 'Fosfor', in Znamya, 4, 1987, pp. 127-147.

'Dobro vam!', in Znamya, 11, 1988, pp. 5-62.

'Rasskazy i esse', in Znamya, 5, 1989, pp. 7-30. This included the following: 'Zhilitsa'; 'Mama'; 'Na vechnom pokoe'; and 'Sikstinskaya Madonna'.

Roskina refers to a work, which as far as the author is aware has yet to be published. 'Pamyat' Roskina'. See Roskina, op. cit., p. 129.

Ocherki.

'Gotovnost' k podvigu', in Izvestiya, 02.07.1941.

'Korichnevye klop'y', in Izvestiya, 12.07.1941.

Stalingrad Hits Back, trans., A. Fineberg and D. Fromberg, FLPH, M., 1942.

Gody voyny, Ogiz, M., 1946. This is the most important collection of Grossman's wartime ocherki and povesti. In chronological order they are as follows:

'Narod bessmertn' (1942), 'Staryy uchitel'' (1942), 'Volga-Stalingrad' (1942), 'Rota molodykh avtomatchikov' (1942), 'Dusha krasnoarmeytsa' (1942), 'Stalingradskaya bitva' (1942), 'Vlasov' (1942), 'Tsaritsyn-Stalingrad' (1942), 'Glazami Chekhova' (1942), 'Napravlenie glavnogo udara' (1942), 'Po dorogam nastupleniya' (1942), 'Novyy den'' (1942), 'Voennyi sovet' (1942), 'Stalingradskoe voysko' (1942), 'Stalingradskiy front' (1942), 'Zhizn'' (1943), 'Zhizn' istrebitel'nogo polka' (1943), 'Iyul' 1943 goda' (1943), 'Orel' (1943), 'Pervyy den' na Dnepre' (1943), 'Ukraina' (1943), 'Mysli o vesennem nastuplenii' (1944), 'Sovetskaya granitsa' (1944), 'Bobruyskiy kotel' (1944), 'Dobro sil'nee

zla' (1944), 'Boy v Lyubline' (1944), 'V gorodakh i selakh Pol'shi' (1944), 'Treblinskiy ad' (1944), 'Put' k nemetskoy granitse' (1944), 'Tvorchestvo pobedy' (1944), 'Moskva-Varshava' (1945), 'Mezhdru Visloy i Oderom' (1945), 'Germaniya' (1945), 'Sila nastupleniya' (1945).

Treblinskiy ad, Voenizdat, M., 1945.

'Poezdka v Kirgiziyu', in God XXXI. Al'manakh Pervyy, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1948, pp. 207-237.

'V znakomykh mestakh', in Ogonyok, 45, 1953, pp. 9-16.

'Vasiliiy Grossman, iz zapisnykh knizhek voennykh let. 1941-1942', in Literaturnoe nasledstvo. Sovetskie pisateli na frontakh Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny. Kniga II. Tom 78, Izdatel'stvo nauka, M., 1966, pp. 158-179.

See too 'Vasiliiy Grossman, iz zapisnykh knizhek', in Voprosy literatury, 6, 1987, pp. 157-177.

Chernaya kniga. O zlodeyskom povsemestnom ubiystve evreev nemetsko-fashistskimi zakhvatchikami vo vremenno-okkupirovannykh rayonakh sovetskogo soyuza i v lageryakh unichtozheniya Pol'shivo vremya voyny 1941-1945 gg., Tarbut publishers, Jerusalem., 1980. Grossman wrote or edited the following texts: 'Ubiystvo evreev v Berdicheve', pp. 27-35; 'Istoriya minskogo getto' (ed); 'Rasskaz starogo cheloveka, Shmueliya Dovida Kugelya' (ed), pp. 164-167; 'Rasskaz Doktora Ol'gi Goldveyn' (ed), pp. 184-189; 'Brennery iz Belestoka' (ed), pp. 216-219; 'Kolkhoznitsa Yuliya Kukhta spasla evreyskikh detey' (ed), pp. 314-315; 'V Khorol'skom lagere' (ed), pp. 339-342; 'Treblinka', pp. 350-373.

'Ukraina bez evreev', printed and translated from the Yiddish, in Shimon Markish's Vasiliiy Grossman. Na evreyskie temy, Vol. 2, 1985, pp. 333-340. As far as the author is aware this is the sole publication of this ocherk in Russian.

Plays.

'Esli verit' pifagoreytsam', in Znamya, 7, 1946, pp. 68-107.

Bibliography: Part II

Vasiliy Grossman: Secondary Literature

- Anatol'eva, N. 'V neravnom boyu', in Grani, 18, 1953, pp.103-117.
- Anninskiy, L. 'Mirozdan'e Vasiliya Grossmana', in Druzhba narodov, 10, 1988, pp.253-263.
- Atarov, N. 'Predislovie', in Dobro Vam!, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1967, pp.3-17.
- Bocharov, A. G. Vasiliy Grossman, kritiko-biograficheskiy ocherk, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1970.
- Chelovek i Voyna. Idei sotsialisticheskogo gumanizma v poslevoennoy proze o voyne, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1973. Detailed references to Grossman. See pp.67, 99-105, 158-164, 360.
- 'Pravoe delo Vasiliya Grossmana', in Oktyabr', 1, 1988, pp.128-134.
- 'Bolevye zony', in Oktyabr', 2, 1988, pp.104-109.
- 'Sud'ba narodnaya', in Oktyabr', 3, 1988, pp.150-156.
- 'Chast' pravdy - eto ne pravda...', in Oktyabr', 4, 1988, pp.143-148.
- 'Vremya sobirat' kamni, Malaya proza Vasiliya Grossmana', in Voprosy literatury, 7, 1989, pp.3-38.
- Böhl, H. 'Die Fähigkeit zu trauern', in Die Zeit, 49, 30.11.1984, pp.11-12.
- Bubennov, M. 'O romane Vasiliya Grossmana « Za pravoe delo »', in Pravda, 13.02.1953, pp.3-4.
- Ded'kov, I. 'Zhizn' protiv sud'by', in Novyy mir, 11, 1988, pp.229-241.
- Derman, A. 'Podvig pisatelya', in Znamya, 8, 1946, pp.200-214.
- Dobrotvorskiy, N. 'Eto ne geroi Stalingrada', in Zvezda, 5, 1953, p.187.
- Ellis, N. J. 'Vasiliy Grossman: The Challenge to Ideology', in Literatur und Perestrojka, Sammelband der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Osteuropakunde, Band 27, hrsg., E. Reißner, Arno Spitz, Berlin., 1990, pp. 25-44

- 'Concepts of War in L. N. Tolstoy and V. S. Grossman', in Tolstoy Studies Journal, vol.2, 1989, pp.101-108.
- 'Vasiliy Grossman: The Genesis of Heresy 1937-1941', Modern Language Review, in press.
- Ermilov, V. 'Vrednaya p'esa', in Samaya demokraticeskaya literatura mira: stat'i 1946-1947 gg., Izdatel'stvo literaturnaya gazeta, M., 1947, pp.32-39.
- Etkind, E. 'Dvadtsat' let spustya' Introductory article to Zhizn' i sud'ba, S., 1980, v-xi. First published in Vremya i my, 45, 1979, pp.5-13.
- 'Sovetskie tabu', in Syntaksis, 9, 1981, pp.3-20.
- '1946 god: Krushenie nadezhd', in Vremya i my, 89, 1986, pp.173-185.
- 'Zhizn' i sud'ba knigi', in Vremya i my, 101, 1988, pp.198-203.
- 'Net dvukh pravd. O sovetskom izdani i romana Vasiliya Grossmana "Zhizn' i sud'ba", in Strana i mir, 6, 1988, p.4.
- Fadeev, A. 'Za pravoe delo V. Grossmana', in Za tridtsat' let, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1957, pp.794-796.
- 'Nekotorye voprosy raboty Soyuza pisateley', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 28.03.1953, pp.2-4.
- Feinstein, E. 'From Working Place and Battlefield', in Times Literary Supplement, 22.11.1985, p.1315.
- Frankel, E. R. 'Literary Policy in Stalin's Last Year', in Soviet Studies, vol., XXVIII, no 3., 1976, pp.391-405.
- Galanov, B. 'Epopeya narodnoy bor'by', in Molodoy kommunist, 1, 1953, pp.117-123.
- Guber, F. 'Pamyat' i pis'ma', in Trud, 20.10.1989, p.3.
- Kardin, V. 'Zhizn' - eto svoboda', in Ogonyok, 23, 1988, pp.21-24.
- Kasack, W. Entsiklopedicheskiy slovar' russkoy literatury s 1917, Overseas, London., 1988, pp.241-242
- Kublanovskiy, Yu. 'Zhizn' i sud'ba Vasiliya Grossmana', in Grani, 141, 1986, pp.284-288.
- Kulish, V. and Oskotskiy, V. 'Epos voyny narodnoy', in Voprosy literatury, 10, 1988, pp.27-87.

- Kuznetsov, M. 'Shkola muzhestva', in Literatura i iskusstvo, 14.08.1943. British Library Microfilm, London.
- Lauer, R. 'Hitler als Vögelchen im Netz', in Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 05.01.1985, p. 4.
- Lavretskiy, A. 'Sotsialisticheskiy chelovek v Otechestvennoy Voyne', in Znamya, 12, 1943, pp. 269-277.
- Lavrova, Kl. 'O real'nom schast'i geroev V. Grossmana', in Krasnaya nov', 4, 1941, pp. 197-210.
- Leech-Ansprach, G. 'Stalingrad in russischer Sicht', in Die Welt am Sonntag, 06.10.1985. Photocopy, page number obscured.
- Levin, F. 'Vasiliy Grossman, Vstupitel'naya stat'ya', in Povesti, Rasskazy, Ocherki, Voenizdat, M., 1958, pp. 3-14.
- Lektorskiy, A. 'Roman, iskazhayushchiy obrazy sovetskikh lyudey', in Kommunist, 3, 1953, pp. 106-115.
- Leshchinskiy, N. 'Eshche o « filosofii » Chepyzhina i Shtruma', in Zvezda, 5, 1953, p. 186-187.
- Lipkin, S. Stalingrad Vasiliya Grossmana, Anne Arbor, Michigan, 1986.
- 'Rukopisi ne goryat, kak byl spasen roman Vasiliya Grossmana « Zhizn' i sud'ba »', in Russkaya mysl', 05.05.1989, pp. 8-9.
- Lubenskiy, S. Review of Zhizn' i sud'ba, in Slavic and East European Journal, 2, 1982, pp. 251-252.
- L'vov, S. 'Rozhdenie epopei', in Ogonyok, 47, 1952, pp. 24.
- Markish, S. Na evreyskie temy, Vasiliy Grossman, 2 vols, Biblioteka Aliya, Israel, 1985.
- 'A Russian Writer's Jewish Fate', in Commentary, vol. 81, 4, 1986, pp. 39-47.
- 'Lyubil li Rossiya Vasiliy Grossman?', in Russkaya mysl', 21.02.1986, p. 12.
- Morokhovskiy, Yu. 'Nechemu učit'sya u takikh geroev', in Zvezda, 5, 1953, p. 188.
- Myasnikov, A. 'Literatura i voyna', in Oktyabr', 11, 1942, pp. 136-144.
- Murav'eva, I. 'Dvadtsat' let spustya...', in Grani, 149, 1988, pp. 259-267.
- Nagorskiy, A. 'Totalitarian Horrors', in Newsweek, 23.12.1985. Photocopy page number obscured.

- Nekrasov, V. V zhizni i pis'makh, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1971, pp.149-155.
- Ortenberg, D. 'Pisateli na voyne', in Zvezda, 3, 1975, pp.149-153.
- Pertsov, V. Podvig i geroy. Etyudy o sovetskoy literature, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1946.
- Pomerants, G. 'Chto skazat' Iovu?', in Strana i mir, 48, 1988, pp.138-151.
- Rakusa, I. 'Freiwillig verzichtet der Mensch nicht auf die Freiheit', in Neue Zürcher Zeitung, 03.05.1985, p.41.
- Reißner, E. 'Bleibt uns die Hoffnung auf Menschlichkeit? Wassilij Grossmans Monumentalroman "Leben und Schicksal", broadcast under the auspices of Sender Freies Berlin.
- Roskina, N. Chetyre glavy iz literaturnykh vospominaniy, YMCA Press, Paris, 1980, pp.101-129.
- Saltovskaya, L. 'Shchemyashchaya nota', in Moskva, 8, 1963, pp.216-218.
- Shaginyan, M. 'Korni oshibok', in Izvestiya, 26.03.1953, pp.2-3.
- Shturman, D. 'Stukachi i gong spravedlivosti', in Vremya i my, 42, 1979, pp.133-149.
- Sirotkin, V. 'Vse menyaetsya! O povesti Vasiliya Grossmana « Vse techet » i ne tol'ko o ney', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 23.08.1989, p.4.
- Stolypin, A. 'Oshibochnaya istoricheskaya kontseptsiya V. Grossmana', in Grani, 80, 1971, pp.216-223.
- Struve, G. Review of Vse techet, in Slavic Review, vol.31, 4, 1972, pp.943-946.
- Svirskiy, G. 'Vosem' minut svobody', in Grani, 136, 1985, pp.295-305.
- Symons, J. 'Review of Vse techet, in Observer, 04.03.1973. Photocopy, page number obscured.
- Taylor, M.J. The Life and Works of Vasiliy S. Grossman from 1934-1941, M.A. thesis, Department of Russian, University of Manchester, 1984.
- Taratuta, E. 'Chestnaya zhizn' i tyazhkaya sud'ba, vospominaniya o Vasiliy Grossmane', in Ogonyok, 40, 1987, pp.22-23.
- Vodolazov, G. 'Lenin i Stalin, filosofsko-sotsiologicheskii kommentariy k povesti V. Grossmana « Vse techet », in Oktyabr', 6, 1989, pp.3-29.
- Voynovich, V. 'Zhizn' i sud'ba Vasiliya Grossmana i ego romana', in Posev, 11, 1984, pp.53-55.

Yampol'skiy, B. 'Poslednyaya vstrecha s Vasiliem Grossmanom', in Kontinent, 8, 1976, pp. 133-154.

Zaks, B. 'Nemnogo o Grossmane', in Kontinent, 26, 1980, pp. 352-362.

Zolotusskiy, I. 'Voyna i svoboda', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 08.06.1988, p. 4.

Unattributed articles.

22 'V Soyuze sovetskikh pisateley', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 28.03.1953, pp. 2-4.

23 'Nasushchnye zadachi sovetskoy literatury', in Kommunist, 21, 1952, pp. 14-23.

'Lish' tot dostoin zhizni i svobody', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 24.08.1988, p. 5.

'Soviet Culture Today', in The New Statesman, 16.12.1944, pp. 402-403.

'Rukoyu avtora', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 14.12.1988, p. 3.

'Otklik', in Oktyabr, 9, 1988, pp. 205-207.

'Vyshe znanya ideynosti v literature!', in Znanya, 10, 1946, pp. 27-37.

'Vasiliy Grossman: Zhizn' i sud'ba', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 02.03.1988, pp. 2-3.

'O romane V. Grossmana "Za pravoe delo"', in Molodoy kommunist, 4, 1953, pp. 127-128.

'Na lozhnom puti - O romane V. Grossmana "Za pravoe delo"', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 21.02.1953, pp. 3-4.

'Outlook of the Modern Russian Soldier', in The Times, 22.02.1943, p. 5.

Bibliography: Part III

Secondary Reading and Texts

Adamovich, A. O sovremennoy voennoy proze, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1981.

'Voyna i literatura: Problemy novogo myshleniya', in Voprosy literatury, 6, 1987, pp. 3-34.

Alekseev, S. Gvardeyskiy razgovor. Rasskazy iz Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny, Voenizdat, M., 1979.

Anisimov, I. I. (ed) Literaturnoe nasledstvo, sovetskie pisateli na frontakh Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny, t. 78., Nauka, M., 1966.

Arendt, H. The Origins of Totalitarianism, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, N. Y. & London, 1973.

Eichmann in Jerusalem. A Report on the Banality of Evil, Faber and Faber, London., 1963.

Armstrong, J. A. Soviet Partisans in World War Two, University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

Avidar, Y. The Party and the Army in the Soviet Union, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1985.

Basseches, N. Stalin, trans., E. W. Dickes, Staples Press, London., 1952.

Baklanov, G. Den' nyneshniy i den' minuvshiy, Moskovskiy rabochiy, M., 1977.

Pyad' zemli. Povesti. Rasskazy, Izvestiya, M., 1978.

Belza, S. 'Ispytanie voynoy, proza o voyne v literature sotsialisticheskikh stran', in Znamya, 1, 1975, pp. 230-244.

Berggol'ts, O. Izbrannye proizvedeniya v dvukh tomakh, Khudozhestvennaya literatura, L., 1967.

Berlin, I. The Hedgehog and the Fox. An Essay on Tolstoy's View of History, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London., 1967.

Bocharov, A. 'Istoki pobedy', in Znamya, 5, 1965, pp. 233-247.

'Provereno voynoy', in Novyy mir, 7, 1970, pp. 232-252.

'Sluzhit' pravdoy i veroy...', in Znamya, 11, 1987, pp. 205-213.

Bondarev, Yu. Sobranie sochineniy, Khudozhestvennaya literatura, M.,

1984.

Borshchukov, V. Pole bitvy idey. Sovremennaya zarubezhnaya kritika o sovetskoy literature, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1983.

Bramson, L. and Goethals, G. W. (eds) War: Studies from Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, N.Y., 1964.

Brown, D. Soviet Russian Literature Since Stalin, CUP, 1978.

Bullock, A. Hitler: A Study in Tyranny, Penguin, 14th ed., Middlesex., 1983.

Burch, B. B. (ed) Dictatorship and Totalitarianism, D. Van Nostrand Company, Princeton, 1964.

Bury, J. B. The Idea of Progress. An Enquiry into its Origin and Growth, MacMillan, London., 1928.

Bykov, V. 'Byt' dostoin', in Novyy mir, 11, 1967, pp. 226-227.

'Pravda voyny', in Novyy mir, 4, 1975, pp. 245-248

'Zhizn'yu obyazan', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 06.11.1974.

British Library Microfilm. London.

Vasil' Bykov, Interview, in Literaturnaya gazeta, 18.01. 1989, p. 4.

Sobranie sochineniy, Molodaya gvardiya, M., 1986.

Carr, E.H. A History of Soviet Russia. The Bolshevik Revolution 1917-1923, vol. 3., MacMillan, London., 1953.

What is History?, Penguin, Middlesex., 1974.

Calvocoress, P. and Wint, G. Total War: Causes and Courses of The Second World War, Penguin Books, London., 1972.

Carey, J. (ed) The Faber Book of Reportage, Faber and Faber, London., 1987.

Chicherin, A. Vozniknovenie romana-epopei, Goslitizdat, M., 1959.

Christian, R. F. Tolstoy, A Critical Introduction, CUP, 1969.

Chuykov, V. I. Nachalo puti, Voenizdat, M., 1959.

Citati, P. Tolstoy, trans., Raymond Rosenthal, Schocken, N.Y., 1986.

Clark, K. The Soviet Novel. History as Ritual, University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1981.

Conquest, R. The Great Terror, MacMillan, 1968.

Crouch, M. and Porter, R. Understanding Soviet Politics Through Literature, George Allen & Unwin, London., 1984.

Deutscher, I. The Prophet Armed. Trotsky 1879-1921, OUP, 1954.

Stalin. A Political Biography, Pelican, 9th ed., 1979.

- Dorey, T. A. (ed) Tacitus, in the series Studies in Latin Literature, RKP, 1969.
- Dörzgen, H. 'Er predigt Haß gegen den Krieg: Schriftsteller in der UdssR. Der Fall Bulat Okudschawa', in Franfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 27. 06.1972. British Library Microfilm. Page number obscured.
- Dudley, D. R. The World of Tacitus, Secker & Warburg, London., 1968.
- Dunnigan, J. F. The Russian Front, Germany's War in the East 1941-1945, Arms and Armour Press, London-Melbourne, 1978.
- Ehrenburg, Il'ya. Sobranie sochineniy, Goslitizdat, -M., 1962.
- Eimermacher, K. 'War Literature', in C. D. Kernig (ed) Marxism, Communism and Western Society: A Comparative Encyclopedia, Herder & Herder, N.Y., 1973, pp.328-340.
- Elkin, A. 'Ochen' strannyy ekipazh', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 07.09.1965. British Library Microfilm. Page number obscured.
- Ellis, N. J. 'The Problem of Remarquism in Soviet Russian War Prose', in Scottish Slavonic Review, 11, 1988, pp.91-108.
- 'Vasilii Grossman: The Challenge to Ideology', in Literatur und Perestrojka, Sammelband der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Osteuropakunde, Band 27, hrsg., E. Reißner, Arno Spitz, Berlin., 1990, pp. 25-44.
- 'Concepts of War in L. N. Tolstoy and V. S. Grossman', in Tolstoy Studies Journal, vol 2, 1989, pp.101-108.
- 'Vasilii Grossman: The Genesis of Heresy 1937-1941', in Modern Language Review, in press.
- Epishev, A. 'Vospitanie voina-grazhdanina', in Kommunist, 5, 1964, pp.64-63.
- Erickson, J. The Soviet High Command. A Military-Political History 1918-1941, MacMillan, London., 1962.
- Ermilov, E. 'O traditsiyakh natsional'noy gordosti v russkoy literature', in Literatura i iskusstvo, 07.08.1943. British Library Microfilm. Page number obscured.
- Ermolaev, H. Mikhail Sholokhov and his Art, Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Etkind, E. 'Sovetskiy pisatel' i smert'', in Vremya i my, 26, 1978, pp.132-144.
- Eyulin, A. 'Za vysokuyu ideynost' sovetskoy literatury', in Bolshevik, 10, 1944, pp.39-49.

Fradkin, I. 'Remark 1 spory o nem', in Voprosy literatury, 1, 1963, pp. 92-119.

Gallagher, M. P. The Soviet History of World War Two. Myths, Memories and Realities, Frederick A. Praeger, N.Y. and London., 1963.

Gallie, W. B. Philosophers of Peace and War, Kant, Clausewitz, Marx, Engels and Tolstoy, CUP., 1978.

Garder, M. A History of The Soviet Army, Pall Mall Press, London., 1959.

Gareev, M. 'Velikiy Oktyabr' i zashchita otechestva', in Oktyabr, 2, 1988, pp. 81-92.

Garshin, V. M. Sochineniya, Khudozhestvennaya literatura, M., 1955.

Genatulin, A. 'Tunnel'', in Znamya, 12, 1987, pp. 3-80.

Gibian, G. 'The New and the Old: From an Observer's Notebook', in Problems of Communism, vol. xvi., 1967, pp. 57-64.

Glinkin, P. E. 'Epos narodnogo podviga', in Russkaya literatura, 1, 1971, pp. 23-44.

'Stranitsy geroicheskoy letopisi', in Volga, 5, 1973, pp. 175-183.

'Khudozhestvennye dokumenty voyny', in Zvezda, 7, 1970, pp. 199-205.

Goerlitz, W. Paulus und Stalingrad, London., 1963.

Gomperz, T. Greek Thinkers, A History of Ancient Philosophy, vol. 1, trans., Laurie Magnus, John Murray, London., 1901.

Gorbachev, M. S. Perestroyka, Collins, London., 1987.

Gorbachev, N. 'Sovremennyy voyn i literatura', in Oktyabr, 4, 1973, pp. 201-209.

Gorman, E. 'Soviet Reporter Changed by Hell of Afghan War', in The Times, 14.01.1989, p. 8.

Guderian, H. Erinnerungen eines Soldaten, 9 Auflage, Kurt Vowinkel Verlag, Heidelberg., 1976.

Hayward, M. Writers in Russia: 1917-1978, ed., Patricia Blake, Harvill Press, London., 1983.

Heller, M. Cogs in the Soviet Wheel. The Formation of Soviet Man, trans., David Floyd, Collins, London., 1988.

Henry, P. A Hamlet of his Time, Vsevolod Garshin. The Man, his Works, and his Milieu, Willem A. Meeuws, Oxford., 1983.

Higgins, I. (ed) The Second World War in Literature. Eight Essays,

- Scottish Academic Press, Edinburgh and London., 1987.
- Hingley, R. Russian Writers and Soviet Society 1917-1978, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London., 1979.
- Hosking, G. Beyond Socialist Realism. Soviet Fiction since Ivan Denisovich, Granada Publishing, London., 1980.
- A History of the Soviet Union, Fontana Press Collins/Collins, London., 1985.
- 'The Rediscovery of Politics', 1988 Reith Lectures, in The Listener, Nos 45-50, 1988.
- Inber, V. Sobranie sochineniy, Khudozhestvennaya literatura, M., 1965.
- Johnson, P. A History of the Modern World, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London., 1983.
- A History of the Jews, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London., 1987.
- Jones, E. Red Army and Society. A Sociology of the Soviet Military, Allen & Unwin, 1985.
- Jünger, E. Werke, Klett-Cotta, Stuttgart, 1979.
- Kahn, C. H. The Art and Thought of Heraclitus, CUP, Cambridge., 1979.
- Kardin, V. 'Na voyne, kak na voyne', in Znamya, 8, 1987, pp.207-216.
- Karel'skiy, A. 'Stantsii Ernsta Yungera', in Inostrannaya literatura, 4, 1964, pp.230-236.
- Katukov, A. M. and Tsetaev, E. H. Voenno-patrioticheskoe vospitanie uchashchikhsya po nachal'noy voennoy podgotovke, Prosveshchenie, M., 1984.
- Kazakevich, E. Sobranie sochineniy, Khudozhestvennaya literatura, M., 1985.
- Khrushchev, N. Khrushchev Remembers, trans., Strobe Talbot, Sphere Books Ltd, London., 1971.
- Kirk, G. S. and Raven, J. E. The Presocratic Philosophers. A Critical Study with a Selection Of Texts, CUP., 1957.
- Kir'yan, M. M. 'Nachal'nyy period Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny', in Voenno-istoricheskiy zhurnal, 6, 1988, pp.11-17.
- Kissin, S. F. War and the Marxists. Socialist Theory and Practice in Capitalist War, vol., I, 1848-1918, Andre Deutsch, London., 1988.
- Klein, H (ed) with Flower, J. and Homberger, E. The Second World War in Fiction, MacMillan, London., 1984.
- Knightley, P. The First Casualty. From the Crimea to Vietnam: The War

- Correspondent as Hero, Propagandist and Myth Maker, Harcourt Brace and Jovanovich, N.Y., and London., 1975.
- Kolkowicz, R. The Soviet Military and The Communist Party, Princeton University Press, 1967.
- Kolpakova, E. 'Literature na voyne', in Voprosy literatury, 8, 1957, pp. 59-72.
- Kondratovich, A. 'Chelovek na voyne', in Novyy mir, 6, 1962, pp. 216-228.
- Kopelev, L. 'Pobedy i porazheniya Remarka', in Yunost, 3, 1960, pp. 67-70.
- Korneychuk, A. P'esy, Gosizdat, L. and M., 1948.
- Korobeynikov, M. 'Rasskazy o voyne', in Novyy mir, 2, 1988, pp. 81-92.
- Kozhin, A. N. 'Novye yavleniya v russkom yazyke perioda Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny', in Voprosy Yazykoznaniiya, 6, 1985, pp. 77-87.
- Kron, A. 'Voennaya tema v dramaturgii', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 02.06.1955. British Library Microfilm.
- Kryachko, L. 'Geroy ne khochet vzroslet', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 19.03.1963, pp. 2-3.
- Kuz'michev, I. Geroy i narod. Razdum'ya o sud'bakh epopei, M., 1973.
- 'Zametki o sovremennom voennom romane', in Oktyabr, 3, 1965, pp. 185-197.
- Labeledz, L. Solzhenitsyn a Documentary Record, Penguin, 1974.
- Lazarev, L. 'Voennye romany K. Simonova', in Novyy mir, 8, 1964, pp. 238-252.
- 'Sorokovye, frontovye...', in Novyy mir, 6, 1971, pp. 246-261.
- 'Dolgaya byla vojna...', in Oktyabr, 1, 1975, pp. 185-201.
- Vasil' Bykov: ocherk tvorchestva. Khudozhestvennaya literatura, M., 1979.
- 'Na vsyu ostavshuyusya zhizn'', in Novyy mir, 11, 1986, pp. 217-237.
- Lemmermann, H. Kriegserziehung im Kaiserreich. Studien zur politischen Funktion von Schule und Schulmusik 1890-1918, Bremen., 1984.
- Levi, P. If This is a Man and The Truce, trans., Stuart Woolf, Sphere Books Ltd, 1987.
- Liebchen, G. Ernst Jünger. Seine literarischen Arbeiten in den 20er Jahren. Eine Untersuchung zur gesellschaftlichen Funktion von

- Literatur, Bouvier Verlag, Bonn., 1977.
- Lochtin, S. 'The War in the Soviet Novel. From the Heroic to the Prosaic', in Soviet Survey, 33, 1960, pp.62-69.
- Lukács, G. Die Zerstörung der Vernunft, Luchterhand, Darmstadt., 1962.
- Lur'e, Ya. S. 'Differentsial istorii v « Voynye i mire », in Russkaya literatura, 3, 1978, pp.43-60.
- Marsh, R. J. Soviet Fiction Since Stalin: Science, Politics and Literature, Croom and Helm, 1986.
- McMillin, A. 'War and Peace in the Prose of Vasil Bykov', in Die Welt der Slaven, 1, 1983, pp.110-121.
- Mel'nik, Ya. 'Tak chego my boimsya?', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 22.06.1988, p.4.
- Mercer, D. et al The Fog of War, Heinemann, London., 1987.
- Mikhaylovskiy, N. 'Malen'kie rasskazy o bol'shoy voyne', in Zvezda, 5, 1988, pp.79-94.
- Moore, H. T. and Parry, A. Twentieth Century Russian Literature, Heinemann, London., 1976.
- Motyleva, T. 'Remark i sovetskie chitateli', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 01.03.1960. British Library Microfilm.
- Inostrannaya literatura i sovremennost', Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1961.
- Morson, G. S. (ed) Literature and History. Theoretical Problems and Russian Case Studies, Stanford University Press, California, 1986.
- Nef, J. U. War and Human Progress, Norton Library, N.Y., 1968.
- Nekrasov, V. Izbrannye proizvedeniya, M., 1962.
- Stalingrad, Posse-Verlag, Frankfurt/Main, West Germany, 1981.
- 'Ob « okopnoy pravde » i prochem', in Russkaya mysl', 26.12.1986, p.7.
- 'Segodnya i tridtsat' let nazad', in Russkaya mysl', 15.05.1987., p.6.
- Nekrich, A. 'Stalin i natsistskaya Germaniya', in Kontinent, 24, 1980, pp.239-261.
- Niebuhr, R. Moral Man and Immoral Society, N.Y., 1960.
- Novikov, V. Geroicheskomu vremeni - geroicheskoe iskusstvo, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1964.
- 'Epos Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny', in Zvezda, 5, 1970

pp. 194-202.

- Okudzhava, B. Bud' zdorov, shkolyar i stikhi, Possev-Verlag, Frankfurt/Main, West Germany, 1964.
- Front prikhodit k nam. Povest', Detskaya literatura, M., 1967.
- 'Besshumnaya eskadriliya', in Novyy mir, 2, 1988, pp. 3-5.
- Palkin, I. 'Neizvestnye soldaty', in Zvezda, 5, 1988, pp. 167-179.
- Panferov, F. 'O cherepakakh i cherepushkakh', in Oktyabr, 5, 1946, pp. 151-162.
- Pavlov, S. P. Vospevat' geroicheskoe, Voenizdat, M., 1965.
- Petrov, V. June 22, 1941: Soviet Historians and the German Invasion, University of South Carolina Press, 1968.
- Pigurnov, A. 'Deyatel'nost' voennykh sovetov, politorganov i partiynykh organizatsiy po ukrepleniyu edinonachaliya v period Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny', in Voенно-istoricheskiy zhurnal, 4, 1961, pp. 47-56.
- Piskunov, V. 'Znamenostsy pobedy', in Zvezda, 2, 1974, pp. 192-202.
- Plotkin, L. Literatura i Voyna. Velikaya Otechestvennaya Voyna v russkoy sovetskoy proze, Sovetskiy pisatel', L., & M., 1967.
- Polkinghorne, J. Science and Creation, SPCK, London., 1988.
- Poshchin, A. 'Voennaya tema v tvorchestve leningradskikh khudozhnikov', in Neva, 5, 1970, pp. 195-201.
- Pospelov, P. N. (et al) Istoriya Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny Sovetskogo Soyuza 1941-1945 v shesti tomakh, Voenizdat, M., 1965.
- Powell, D. 'Voенно-patrioticheskoe vospitanie - odin iz istochnikov militarizma', in Obozrenie, 20, 1986, pp. 95-104.
- Prochko, I. 'Memuarnaya literatura o Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voynе', in Voенно-istoricheskiy zhurnal, 5, 1961, pp. 95-104.
- Pruck, E. 'Russische Kriegsdichtung in der Sowjetliteratur. Versuch eines Überblicks', in Wehrkunde, 7, 1958, pp. 148-153.
- 'Das Bild des deutschen Soldaten im Spiegel der Sowjetliteratur', in Wehrkunde, 12, 1966, pp. 643-650.
- 'Tendenzen in der sowjetischen Wehr und Kriegsliteratur', in Osteuropa, 10, 1966, pp. 711-716.
- Putkevich, M. N. Dialeticheskiy materializm, M., 1961.
- Remarque, E. M. Im Westen nichts Neues, Kiepenheuer & Witsch, Köln,

1984.

Remark, E. M. Na zapadnom fronte bez peremen, Vozvrashchenie, Tri tovarishcha, perevod s nemetskogo Yu. Afon'kin, Leninizdat, L., 1959.

Rudnyy, V. 'O dokumental'nykh knigakh i memuarakh', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 02.06.1955. British Library Microfilm.

Rutherford, A. The Literature of War: Five Studies in Heroic Virtue, MacMillan, London., 1978.

Rybkin, E. Voyna i politika, Voenizdat, M., 1959.

Ryurikov, B. 'Okopnye budni i ikh geroika', in Zvezda, 5, 1947, pp. 173-181.

Salisbury, H. The Siege of Leningrad, Secker & Warburg, London., 1969.

Schapiro, L. 1917 The Russian Revolutions and the Origins of Present-Day Communism, Penguin Books, 1984.

Seaton, A. Stalin as Warlord, B. T. Batsford, Ltd, London., 1976.

Shaposhnikov, V. 'Tsena pobedy', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 22.06.1988, p. 4.

Shatilov, Gen. 'Bol'shaya, blagorodnaya tema', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 28.05.1955. British Library Microfilm.

Shtut, S. Kakov ty chelovek?, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1964.

Simonov, K. Sobranie sochineniy, M., 1967.

'Chitaya Tolstogo', in Novyy mir, 12, 1969, pp. 162-172.

Slonim, M. Soviet Russian Literature. Writers and Problems, OUP, 1977.

Smith, H. 'Patriotism: World War Two Was Only Yesterday', in The Russians, Sphere Books Ltd, London., 1977, pp. 369-397.

Solov'ev, B. 'Zametki o kritike', in Novyy mir, 3, 1948, pp. 137-153.

Solzhenitsyn, A. Arkhipelag Gulag 1918-1956, Opyt khudozhestvennogo issledovaniya, vols., I-II, YMCA-Press, Paris., 1973.

Spengler, O. Der Untergang des Abendlandes. Umriss einer Morphologie der Weltgeschichte, Verlag-C. H. Beck, Munich., 1980.

Ssachno, von Helen. Der Aufstand der Person, Argon Verlag, Berlin., 1965.

Stadnyuk, I. Sobranie sochineniy, Molodaya gvardiya, M., 1985.

Stalin, I. V. Works (ed) Robert H. McNeal, The Hoover Institute on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, 1967.

On The Great Patriotic War of The Soviet Union, FLPH, M., 1944.

Steiner, G. Real Presences, Faber & Faber, Boston and London., 1989.

- Struve, G. Russian Literature Under Lenin and Stalin 1917-1953, University of Oklahoma Press, 1971.
- Suchkov, B. 'Kniga, kotoraya sudit', in Inostrannaya literatura, 4, 1955, pp.201-208.
- Surkov, A. Sobranie sochineniy, M., 1965.
- Svirskiy, G. Na lobnom meste. Literatura npravstvennogo soprotivleniya, Overseas Publications Interchange Ltd, London., 1979.
- Wright, Q. 'Voennoye slovo i slovo voennogo pisatel'ya', in Revue des Études Slaves, 54, 1982, pp.355-385.
- Syme, R. Tacitus, vol. 1., Clarendon Press, Oxford., 1958.
- Tolstoy, A. Sobranie sochineniy, M., 1961.
- Tolstoy, L. N. Polnoe Sobranie Sochineniy, M., 1960.
- Thun, N. Krieg und Literatur. Studien zur sowjetischen Prosa von 1941 bis zur Gegenwart, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin., 1977.
- Tikhonov, N. S. Sobranie sochineniy, M., 1985.
- Toffler, A. The Third Wave, Collins, London., 1980.
- Toper, P. 'Chelovek na voyne', in Voprosy literatury, 4, 1961, pp.20-51.
- Radt, zhizni na zemle. O voennoy teme v literature, Sovetskiy pisatel', M., 1971.
- Ulam, A. B. Stalin the Man and his Era, Allen Lane, 1974.
- Van Ackern, K-D. Bulat Okudžava und die kritische Literatur über den Krieg, Otto Sagner, Munich., 1976.
- Vasil'eva, T. 'Slezy nevoli', in Zvezda, 5, 1988, pp.32-76.
- Vernon, G. D. (ed) Soviet Perceptions of War and Peace, National Defense University Press, Washington., 1981.
- Vigor, P. H. The Soviet View of War, Peace and Neutrality, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London & Boston., 1975.
- Walker, B. The Annals of Tacitus. A Study in the Writing of History, Manchester University Press, 1951.
- Walzer, M. Just and Unjust Wars, Basic Books, N.Y., 1977.
- Werth, A. The Year of Stalingrad: An Historical Record and a Study of Russian Mentality, Methods and Policies, Hamish Hamilton, London., 1946.
- Werth, A. Russia at War 1941-1945, Barrie and Rockcliff, London., 1964.
- Wright, Q. A Study of War, abridged ed., University of Chicago Press,

1965.

Yehoshua, A. G. The Black Years of Soviet Jewry 1939-1953, trans., Yosef Schachter and Dov Ben-Abba, Boston., 1971.

Yermakov, Oleg. 'Rasskazy', in Znamya, 3, 1989, pp. 93-119.

Zamyatin, E. I. My, Inter-Language Literary Associates, N. Y., 1967.

Zaytsev, V. Za Volgoy zemli dlya nas ne bylo, Izdatel'stvo DOSAF, M., 1971.

Zhilin, P. and Makarov, V. 'Memuarist i istoriya', in Krasnaya zvezda, 30.05.1967. British Library Microfilm.

Ziemke, E. F. Stalingrad to Berlin, The German Defeat in the West, Dorset Press, Washington., 1968.

Zubkov, Yu. 'Chelovek i voyna', in Oktyabr, 7, 1970, pp.199-213.

Unattributed Texts and Reference Works.

'Vospevat' geroicheskoe', in Krasnaya zvezda, 09.02.1964. British Library Microfilm.

'V gostyakh u Remarka', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 01.11.1962. British Library Microfilm.

'V imya zhizn' na zemle', in Voprosy literatury, 5, 1985, pp.3-114.

'Zheleznyy zakon distsipliny', in Krasnaya zvezda, 04.08.1942.

British Library Microfilm.

A Dictionary of Scientific Communism, Progress Publishers, M., 1984.

The Philosophical Heritage of V. I. Lenin and Problems of Contemporary War, trans., USAAF, in vol.5. of the series Soviet Military Thought, 1972.

Istoriya russkoy sovetskoy literatury, t.3., 1941-1945, Akademiya Nauk SSSR, Institut Mirovoy Literatury imeni A. M. Gorkogo, M., 1961.

'Afgantsy', in Znamya, 7, 1988, pp.185-219.

'Pomnit' uroki istorii', in Voенно-istoricheskiy zhurnal, 6, 1988, pp.3-10.

'Istoriya i literatura', in Literaturnaya gazeta, 18.05.1988, pp.4-5.

'Aktual'nye voprosy istoricheskoy nauki i literatury', in Voprosy istorii, 6, 1988, pp.4-99.

Frontovye Ocherki o Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyne v trekh tomakh, Voenizdat, M., 1958.

Russkie-sovetskie pisateli-prozaiki. Bibliograficheskiy ukazatel',

t. 1., L., 1959.

'Vzyvayushchiy', in Ogonyok, 8, 1989, pp. 7 & 30-31.



Additional Entries

111

Additional Entries

Additional Entries

